

THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS TO FOSTER
RELIGION IN EDUCATION

Vol. IX

August, 1941

No. 3

THE CONVERSION OF PAUL	Mary E. Andrews	147
JESUS AND THE CHARISMATIC TYPE	Amos N. Wilder	151
THE GOD OF MY FATHER—A STUDY OF PATRIARCHAL RELIGION	Herbert Gordon May	155
GABRIEL'S TRUMPET	S. Vernon McCasland	159
THE CURRICULUM OF RELIGION AT COLGATE.....	Herman A. Brautigam	162
RALL'S CHRISTIANITY—AN INQUIRY INTO ITS NATURE AND TRUTH (Featured Review)	George F. Thomas	167
NIEBUHR'S THE NATURE AND DESTINY OF MAN (Featured Review)	Joseph Haroutunian	170
EDITORIAL: WHAT DEGREE OF RELATIVISM?		173
BOOK REVIEWS:		
BENNETT, JOHN C., CHRISTIAN REALISM		176
By Edgar Sheffield Brightman		
MACKAY, JOHN A., A PREFACE TO CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY		176
By Herman A. Brautigam		
GARRISON, WINFRED ERNEST, FAITH OF THE FREE.....		178
By Thomas S. Kepler		
BRYDEN, W. W., THE CHRISTIAN'S KNOWLEDGE OF GOD		179
By S. Vernon McCasland		
PRATT, JAMES BISSETT, CAN WE KEEP THE FAITH?		179
By Carl E. Purinton		
SOARES, THEODORE GERALD, THE ORIGINS OF THE BIBLE		181
CHUTE, MARCHETTE, THE SEARCH FOR GOD		182
By John W. Flight		
SMITH, J. M. P., AND IRWIN, WILLIAM A., THE PROPHETS AND THEIR TIMES		183
By Robert H. Pfeiffer		
MOULD, ELMER W. K., THE WORLD-VIEW OF JESUS		184
By Edgar Sheffield Brightman		
OGG, GEORGE, THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF JESUS.....		185
By Floyd V. Filson		
S. H. HOOKE AND OTHERS, THE NEW TESTAMENT IN BASIC ENGLISH....		186
By Carl E. Purinton		
ROBINSON, H. WHEELER, THE BIBLE IN ITS ANCIENT AND ENGLISH VERSIONS		187
By J. Philip Hyatt		
LATOURETTE, KENNETH SCOTT, THE GREAT CENTURY		188
By Charles S. Braden		
EDDY, SHERWOOD, THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE AMERICAN DREAM.....		189
By Franklin I. Sheeder		
HART, HORNELL, CHART FOR HAPPINESS		190
By J. Howard Howson		
MECKLIN, JOHN M., THE PASSING OF THE SAINT		191
MOSELEY, J. R., MANIFEST VICTORY		191
By John Pitt Deane		

ASCH, SHOLEM, WHAT I BELIEVE	192
By J. Calvin Keene	
BOOK NOTICES	194
THE ASSOCIATION:	
NAMES NOT ON MEMBERSHIP LIST PUBLISHED IN FEBRUARY, 1941.....	199
PERSONNEL	199

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

MARY E. ANDREWS is chairman of the Department of Religion at Goucher College and author of *The Ethical Teaching of Paul* and of several articles in Pauline research.

HERMAN A. BRAUTIGAM is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Colgate University. He is co-author of *Experience, Reason and Faith*, a survey text in philosophy and religion published last year.

JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN is a member of the faculty of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, in the department of Systematic Theology. He is author of the recent book, *Wisdom and Folly in Religion*.

HERBERT G. MAY is Associate Professor of Old Testament at the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, and was from 1931-34 epigrapher on the staff of the Oriental Institute's Megiddo Expedition in Palestine. He is co-author of *Culture and Conscience, An Archaeological Study of the New Religious Past in Ancient Palestine* (with W. C. Graham) and *The Material Remains of the Megiddo Cult* (with R. M. Engberg).

S. VERNON McCASLAND is Professor of Religion at the University of Virginia. He is author of *The Resurrection of Jesus* and joint-author of *Environmental Factors in Christian History* and of *Faith of the Free*.

GEORGE F. THOMAS is Professor of Religious Thought at Princeton University and President of the American Theological Society for next year. His recent book, *Spirit And Its Freedom*, is a study in the philosophy of spirit and its ethical and social implications.

AMOS N. WILDER is Professor of New Testament Interpretation at the Andover Newton Theological School and author of *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus*.

Published in February, May, August and November by the National Association of Biblical Instructors. Publication Office, 36 East Main Street, Somerville, New Jersey. Editorial Office, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin. The subscription price is \$3.00 per annum. Single copies, 75 cents. Entered as second-class matter February 14, 1939, at the post office at Somerville, New Jersey, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

VOLUME IX

AUGUST, 1941

No. 3

The Conversion of Paul

MARY E. ANDREWS

THE SUBJECT of Paul's conversion has precipitated a goodly flow of printer's ink, usually in connection with expositions of Paul's discovery of "justification by faith." Paul's own scant description of the great experience does not in itself warrant this, even if we assume the probability, as has recently been done, that 2 Cor. 12:1-5 as well as Gal. 1:15-16 refers to this momentous experience which certainly changed the direction of Paul's life, and replaced a fanatical zeal for Judaism with a similar zeal for his new gospel. There is evidence that Paul considered his new message Judaism as Judaism ought to be if Jews really understood Torah (Phil. 3:3; Gal. 6:16; Rom. 2:29).

Paul lists his Jewish credentials in Phil. 3:5-7. They are authentic and his devotion to his inherited faith was such as to lead him to *persecute* God's church (Phil. 3:6; 1 Cor. 15:9; Gal. 1:13). His new faith to which he gave a similar loyalty brought upon him what he calls *persecution* (2 Cor. 11:24-27). He tells the Thessalonian Christians (1 Thess. 2:15) that the Jews in Judea *persecuted* the Christians there. He definitely feared the Judean Jews as he anticipated his reception in Palestine when he was about to take the money collected in Gentile areas for the relief of the Judean churches (Rom. 15:31). In Gal. 6:12 Paul indicates that his opponents are

being circumcised on the ground that this prevents their being *persecuted* for the cross of Christ. His other reference, Gal. 5:11, to his own *persecution* is not as clearly indicative of Jews or Judaisers, since here he says that he is being *persecuted* because he is still preaching circumcision, which seems to the writer to link more closely with the antinomian element in the Galatian situation. Paul had trouble in plenty from non-Jews as the Corinthian letters abundantly attest. II Thess. 1:4 alludes to *persecution* of the Thessalonians, but the context does not indicate any connection with the Jews.

This paper approaches the problem of Paul's *conversion* from the assumption that he felt that his message was true *Judaism*. This raises the question as to whether that term is a suitable one to use in describing Paul's change of front. *Conversion* has certain connotations that are not present in Paul's experience. This might indicate that some word which conveys the notion of thorough reorientation, but in no sense repudiation, would be more desirable. There is abundant evidence that the Jews seemed to be singularly blind to the fact that what Paul was preaching was Judaism (Rom. 9:11; Col. 4:11). This fact is easily accounted for: Paul's emphasis on spiritism, other ideas foreign to Judaism, and his most positive statements about the Law.

Paul states that as a Pharisee his observ-

ance of the Law had been blameless (Phil. 3:6), and it is not going beyond the evidence to assume that the Law was of central importance to him prior to his momentous experience, even if Tarsian Judaism was not exactly like Palestinian Judaism. Before the vision-experience that changed the direction of his life he undoubtedly accepted Torah as a whole in both its halachic and haggadic aspects. The Law was *one* to the Jews. He did not separate the ethical and the ceremonial, the Law was law. It is not necessary here to go into the problem of Paul's experience under the Law more than to indicate that Rom. 7:7-25 may well be autobiographical. As Dodd has pointed out when Paul uses the pronoun *I* it usually indicates that he is giving personal experience.² This does not imply that his recounting of that experience would not be colored by the reorientation in his life that was so profound.

Montefiore twenty-five years ago accepted the contemporary interpretation of Rom. 7:7-25 as valid to a considerable degree, basing his view upon his conviction, brilliantly defended, that Hellenistic Judaism was not like Rabbinic Judaism, and had never given Paul's sensitive nature the nurture it demanded. Montefiore saw Hellenistic Judaism as Judaism "infected" with alien elements absorbed from its environment, as Judaism on the defensive among scoffing neighbors, particularly with reference to the Sabbath and to the dietary laws, two important areas of Jewish practice. He attributes Paul's theory of man's nature, so contrary to the Rabbinic Judaism of later sources, as due to the modification that Hellenistic Judaism had undergone in response to environmental stimuli.

"Paul may perhaps have yearned to fulfill God's Law but may never have felt absolutely sure that he had fulfilled it. If guilty in one point, was he not in God's eyes, guilty in all? He passion-

ately longed to find God, but perhaps he had no profound assurance that he had found Him. The very things, such as peace and happiness and the presence of God, which to Rabbinic Jews were given by the Law, the Law to this Hellenistic Jew, seemed perhaps powerless to give."³

If there is a large measure of truth in this interpretation it in nowise invalidates Paul's insistence that after his vision-experience he preached true Judaism. Even a Hellenistic Jew would not be expected to turn to the pagan religions which he had always despised, and the problem for Paul was to validate his new values within the framework of Judaism itself. This paper attempts to trace Paul's shift of emphasis from Law to grace or favor. His changed direction gave him a satisfaction that he had not had before the great experience, and in the course of his life as a missionary he made many statements that must have caused him to appear as a veritable renegade to other Jews who did not separate Law and grace as Paul did. For grace was present in Judaism. God had freely chosen Israel, not because of Israel's merit but out of love. It was a national election to salvation, and this was intimately bound up with the Law, the means by which the Jew worked out his salvation in accordance with the will of God. As Moore points out⁴ God *bestowed* "a lot in the world to come" not as wages earned by work, but in pure goodness to a chosen people, and this is just as much grace in a national sense as Paul's conception of man profiting by the merit of Christ is grace or favor in an individual sense. Both are grace. As a Jew, then, Paul was acquainted with Law and grace. When he saw fellow-Jews relaxing the standards of Torah as the Hellenistic members of the cult of Jesus did, he "persecuted" them, convinced that Law was necessary. When he experienced the revo-

lutionary change in his own life, when he became *en Christo*, he too relaxed the rule demanding circumcision of Gentiles and experienced the same reaction from strict Jews that he had formerly visited upon others. Law was still central to the Jew. The Jew had experienced the favor of God, and the crowning evidence of that favor was God's holy Law which he had entrusted to Israel. But the order in Judaism was Law and grace or favor.

Paul's letters reveal that he simply reversed that order. His Judaism is now favor and Law. There is the same collocation of terms but such a shift of emphasis as to change the character of the message until it was no longer recognizable to Jews as Judaism. Paul is now devoted to what he sees as true Judaism whose central theme is the favor of God as revealed through Christ, instead of the favor of God as expressed in divinely revealed Law. A heavenly being whom God powerfully raised from the dead supplants a heavenly revelation mediated through Moses. But the new revelation is as fully authenticated as the older one, and Torah assumes to him a different, though a still great, importance. Torah authenticates the new revelation.

Paul's statements about the Law are very definite and it is easily seen how no loyal Jew could accept Paul's interpretation of the Law and its function. It is useless as a means of salvation (Rom. 3:20-21, 28; Gal. 2:16b, 19, 21); it is a later addition designed to produce transgressions, and valid only until Christ (Gal. 3:19); it was only the attendant on, the way to Christ (Gal. 3:24); it multiplied the offense of Adam (Rom. 5:20); it is temporary, governing a man only as long as he lives (Rom. 7:1, cf. 7:6); it is not sin in itself, but it is the revealer of sin (Rom. 7:7-8); it is the Law that gives sin its power (1 Cor. 15:56); it does not confer the spirit upon man which possession is of prime importance (Gal. 3:2,5); it put mankind under

a curse from which he had to be ransomed (Gal. 3:13; Rom. 3:10; 8:3); this ransom released mankind from slavery to the *stoicheia* (Gal. 4:3) and through this ransom the Christians' sins are forgiven (Col. 1:14); they can no longer be called to account for what they eat or drink or do about monthly feasts or Sabbaths (Col. 2:16); the Law is intended only for those under its authority (Rom. 3:19; 2:12-14, 25; Rom. 5:13; Gal. 5:4); and since Abraham antedated Moses by four hundred and thirty years it is clear that acquittal by *faith* has older authentication than by Law (Gal. 3:17; cf. Gal. 3:7). Nothing could be clearer in Paul's letters than the fact of the necessity of gaining God's acquittal in the Judgment day by other means than by observing the Law.

Turning to the concept of grace or favor we find that Paul sets it in sharp antithesis to Law. He is an apostle by virtue of the favor of God (Gal. 1:15; Rom. 15:16), which favor is conveyed through Christ (Rom. 1:5, cf. 5:2). Paul's new experience was marked by God's favor which was responsible for his powers of work which surpassed all others (1 Cor. 15:10), which helped him bear a trying physical affliction (2 Cor. 12:7-9). Because Christians live under the favor of God (Rom. 5:17,20-21; 6:1, 14, 15) is no reason for thinking that they may sin with impunity. All men sin and come short of God's glory, but their acquittal is by God's favor, their deliverance is through Christ (Rom. 3:24), and the final proof of the love of God is that Christ died for sinners (Rom. 5:6,8,15). Although the mass of Paul's Jewish contemporaries have stubbornly rejected God's method of declaring men acquitted and in consequence are doomed, this sentence is not general. By God's favor, a remnant has been selected, Paul and others (Rom. 11:5-6), but certainly not for anything they have done; otherwise his grace would not be grace. This grace is spreading in the world, reach-

ing greater and greater numbers (2 Cor. 4:15) and Paul pleads with the Corinthians not to waste the favor of God after accepting it (2 Cor. 6:1); it has extended to the Macedonian churches and their experience of God's favor resulted in an outburst of generosity toward the Judean Christians for whom money is being raised. Paul's relations to the world and to the Corinthians were marked by pure motives, godly sincerity, and the favor of God (2 Cor. 1:12). The pillar apostles in Jerusalem recognized God's favor to Paul (Gal. 2:9). To Paul himself the crowning proof of God's favor was the experience that he describes, albeit so briefly, in Gal. 1:16. He mentions it again as the last of a series of vision-experiences vouchsafed to others and finally to him (1 Cor. 15:8).

This revolutionary experience which we have always called his conversion was at the basis of Paul's reoriented life. That re-orientation, he insists, is still within Judaism, but the additions that Paul emphasizes, Spirit, *gnosis* or spiritual illumination, and above all faith or belief, make his new interpretation of Judaism very unacceptable to Jews. Paul's insistence that God's favor is nullified if the Gentile accepts circumcision (Gal. 5:6), that Christ died for nothing if acquittal can come through Law (Gal. 2:21) would seem to the Jew complete repudiation of Torah. But Paul is certainly not repudiating Torah in its non-statutory aspect. His use of Scripture in both Galatians and Romans shows to what degree he still finds Torah valid. His use of allegory is sparing, but he validates his new approach by repeated quoting of Scripture. He uses the term *Law* and then quotes Isaiah (1 Cor. 14:21). His clinching argument against women participating in the Christian meeting at Corinth is an appeal to the Law (1 Cor. 14:34). Torah is no longer the means of salvation but man will

disregard its teaching at his own peril nonetheless.

In brief, the contention of this study is that Paul in seeking to meet the religious needs of the Graeco-Roman world brought to the fore an element in Judaism, namely the favor of God, which as he worked out the idea in varying practical situations came to overshadow the Jews' major emphasis, life according to the revealed will of God as expressed in the Law. Practical expediency dictated that he could not require Gentiles to become Jews as a prerequisite to becoming Christians and in justifying his new procedure he is driven by the logic of circumstance to find his practice validated. This is done through appeal to Torah on the antiquity of the faith way of salvation, and also through the non-Jewish emphasis of permanent indwelling Spirit as a new motivation of conduct which also releases the person *en Christo* from the Law by substituting a more powerful and vital method. Once Paul works out the intellectual basis of his new faith, he sees it valid for all men, Jews and Gentiles, and intended for all men, Gentiles and Jews. Since he was a person who never did things by halves, and one who would find it impossible to doubt any course he had once chosen, he labors and struggles with his problem until he is driven to the enunciation of a doctrine of divine election which in the hands of Augustine and later of Calvin has been of far-reaching influence in Christian theology. But to Paul it was all in Torah and was Judaism as Judaism ought to be!

NOTES

¹D. W. Riddle, *Paul, Man of Conflict*, Nashville, 1940, 208.

²C. D. Dodd, *Romans*, New York, 1932, 107.

³C. G. Montefiore, *Judaism and St. Paul*, New York, 1915, 127-8.

⁴G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Cambridge, 1927, I, 94-95.

Jesus and the Charismatic Type

AMOS N. WILDER

THE PARTICULAR issue dealt with in this article is that of the relation of the Kingdom of God to the moral life. The terms for such a discussion have been set for most students by Heiler's distinction between mystical and prophetic religion. According to his scheme, Jesus was an exponent of prophetic religion. He can be called a mystic in only the loosest sense of the term. The emphasis falls on the ethical and the personal. But we have reason for hesitation in accepting Heiler's scheme as we observe certain continental scholars carrying this so far as to deny legitimacy to all later infiltrations of Greek or Platonic elements into Christianity, beginning with the Fourth Gospel. We are thinking particularly of F. Menegoz and Robert Will at Strassburg, but we see the same tendency in another form in the absolutizing of the distinction between *agape* and *eros*. This tendency to moralize both Judaism and Christianity is found in liberal Protestantism in another respect. It appears particularly in a failure to take account of the supra-moral elements in Biblical religion. In particular, we underestimate the numinous or charismatic aspects of the historical Jesus. We also underestimate the degree to which his doctrine of the Kingdom transcended preoccupation with the moral life. We would suggest that the gospel of Jesus was supra-moral both in the sense that it had antinomian features, and in the sense that it was ultimately concerned with a Kingdom which in important aspects was beyond good and evil. It would follow that essential Christianity is "mystical" in a more specific sense than Heiler would allow. The present paper confines itself to the more limited topic: charismatic versus moral elements in

the person of Jesus.

Persuasive considerations have led scholars to set aside as suspect all passages in the Synoptic Gospel in which ecstatic experiences are assigned to Jesus, or experiences of visions or voices. This judgment has not been altogether unwelcome to a widespread school of interpreters of Jesus who for plausible but unexamined motives tend to identify prophecy at its best with sobriety. Outstanding passages thus questioned are: the Baptism; the Temptation; the Transfiguration; the visionary pronouncement, "I beheld Satan as lightning fallen . . ."; and finally the so-called Johannine saying, which voices an esoteric revelation to Jesus, Lk 10:21ff. Moreover, even the few apparently trustworthy passages in which Jesus connects the Spirit with his work and with that of the disciples are generally discounted as an importation into the situation from the outlook of the church. The effect of such exclusions is to deny to Jesus any features of supra-normal experience such as are clearly present in the case of Paul.

That the narratives of the Baptism, Temptation and Transfiguration cannot go back to actuality in anything like their present form has been convincingly argued.¹ All these experiences of Jesus or his disciples represent assurances to the reader of Mark that despite appearances of a humble ministry there were nevertheless for Jesus and an inner circle divine attestations. The character of these incidents as typical Jewish midrash has been most effectively demonstrated by Bacon.² "The vision of Jesus, the *bath-qol* which declares his divine vocation, the temptation of Satan, these are poetic forms under which some unknown, primitive evangelist has set forth his con-

ception of the true significance of the Lord's career." As for the utterance as to Satan's fall from heaven, granted its genuineness, we may see in it, with Bundy, no more than picturesque language rather than evidence of a visionary experience. The well-supported sayings of Jesus about the operation of the Spirit in his work reduce themselves to only two or three, and it is easy to conclude that this was not a characteristic feature of Jesus' thinking. When we add to this our current explanations of Jesus' healings and exorcisms in terms of contemporary faith cures, we can see how plausible is the exclusion of supra-normal psychical phenomena in the case of Jesus, especially when we remember the diminishing place they seem to have held in the later prophets. "In his religious experience we see a practical, if not a complete, elimination of the ecstatic element in prophecy," says Bundy. And again, "His experience of God is intimate, intense, simple, but in the main too prosaic and practically personal to admit of true mysticism."³ Even admission of his dualistic eschatology does not seem to have led to hesitation in this conclusion.

Here, however, we meet the view of Otto, supported independently by Windisch and D. B. MacDonald, the Islamic specialist. They recognize in one way or another in the whole Semitic tradition what Otto calls the charismatic type. In Otto's view it is closely related to the eschatological outlook. Charismatic gifts, according to him, do not effect miracles in the sense of the *portentum* and the *prodigium*, but they involve, 1. capacity for spiritual and psychic experiences of a distinctive kind, 2. heightened talents such as *kubernesis* (guidance) and *diakrisis* (discernment), 3. operations of the soul and of psychic powers upon other souls⁴. Certain Greek terms taken in their strict religious significance, *exousia*, *dynamic pneuma*, *charisma*, indicate the type. Moreover, the Scriptures convey it still more clearly in the recognized role of the Ish

Elohim or man of God. In Paul's case, who because of his first hand testimony becomes a criterion, we have special manifestations such as glossolalia, horasis, exorcism, gnosis and transport into the third heaven.

Otto argues that Jesus belonged to this charismatic or numinous type, other examples of which he finds in Zoroaster and Mohammed. He agrees with Windisch who holds that the gospel of Mark gives us evidence that Jesus' hearers acknowledged him as such and responded with the emotions of wonder and excitement that would naturally follow. The characterization of him as one with "*exousia*", says Windisch, is "a pre-dogmatic interpretation of Jesus and it reproduces the impression made by his appearance."⁵ Otto is satisfied that Jesus traced his own charismatic gifts to the Spirit as Paul did. The convincingness of Otto's argument lies especially in the light it throws on various aspects of the activity of Jesus and the coherence of all of this with semitic religious conceptions. For instance, one of the most startling features of charismatic activity widely attested at least as a belief if not also as a fact, is confidence in ability to work effects at a distance. Paul gives us in I Cor. 5:3-5 an example of it. The gospels may then rightly ascribe to Jesus confidence in his power to effect cures at a distance. It is to the point that MacDonald reached a belief in telepathy through his observation of charismatic phenomena in Islam. Another example of the unexpected in Otto's view is his exposition of the charismatic gift of the discernment of spirits, a gift acknowledged by Paul, and one assigned to Jesus in the tradition. It is a capacity closely related to that of second sight as well as to exorcism in that it includes power to look into another person's soul or to read his inner state (the power, as it were, to "see through" men, especially demoniacs, and to "name" his disciples).

Otto illustrates amply from the usage of Arabic *walis* and *sufis* and from that of early Christian monasticism. Thus he scrutinizes a wide range of the activities of Jesus. He concludes that he belonged to the type of seer, Ish Elohim, prophet, endowed in a very concrete sense with Spirit, and this in particular reference to the eschatological fulness of the times.

Windisch does not use the term charismatic but is concerned to bring out the role of the Spirit in Jesus' work and in his self-consciousness, arguing also the likelihood of ecstatic experience in his case. He begins by admitting the midrashic character of the Baptism and similar narratives. But he points out that the character of Jesus as spiritistic does not rest only upon these passages but on much additional evidence. 1. His claim of exousia or plenary power in the post-prophetic era, and the spontaneous recognition of it by the people; exemplified particularly in the assertion of the power to forgive sins; for Jn. 20:22,23 shows such power was viewed as given by the Spirit alone. 2. The extraordinary presuppositions conveyed by the expression, *ēlthon*, "I am come. . . ." 3. His view of the mighty works as given him by the Spirit, and transmissible to the disciples. With this and other evidence before him Windisch returns to the passages in dispute, especially the Baptism, and insists that there must have been some charismatic experience of an extraordinary kind lying back of the *exousia* with which Jesus felt himself clothed. We note that Edwyn Bevan writes as follows in his *Sybils and Seers*, "If one may with reverence make any conjecture regarding that which took place in the inner life of Jesus, one might suppose that the voice heard at the Baptism took the form of (such) an audition."

In spite of unconvincing details in Otto's literary criticism here and there, the evidence presented by him and Windisch is very persuasive. In his *Idea of the Holy*,

the former had well established the fact of the numinous in Jesus' person as experienced by his hearers. They were "astounded" at him. They charged that he was "beside himself"—or that he was possessed by Beelzebub. The value of Otto's emphasis lies in his reminder to us of the categories in which men of that time and place would view the emergence of religious leadership in a crisis of social tension and religious susceptibility. In these conditions one who sensed deeply the obscure forces of the occasion and articulated them would inevitably be viewed as, and view himself as, one endowed with numinous authority. Such an objective aspect of religious authority was, however, decisively qualified by the personal terms in which Jesus viewed divine action and in which he viewed human responsibility. On the one hand Jesus felt that he was empowered by the Spirit to dispossess the household of Satan and borne along by the powers of the inbreaking new aeon. On the other hand it was in the spiritual and psychic experiences of this situation that he personalized and ethicized the religious relation.

In stressing the spiritistic aspect of Jesus we do not lose sight of the realism and lucidity with which he met the circumstances of his mission. There is no contradiction here, as a type like that of St. Francis shows. Neither are we insisting that Jesus was an "ecstatic". We find, however, that the evidence is sufficient to confirm what the whole context of Jesus' situation would prepare us for, that his work and message found their ultimate origin and sanction in charismatic endowment, visionary experiences, alterations of personality, such as have been the rule with poets and seers in all ages. This universal phenomenon of "inspiration" was conditioned in Jesus' particular background and took its form both for him and for his hearers in the Semitic and biblical conception of the spirit-endowed man of God, or holy one of God, a

numinous person. Our major confirmation of this spiritistic view of Jesus appears in his apocalyptic eschatology. What Otto called its "irrational" character, its contradiction of the realism that accompanies it, betrays its charismatic origin.

This means that a definite mystical element must be recognized in Jesus' self-consciousness.⁸ It is not different in kind from the similar endowment of the prophets, but the prominence of the charismatic gifts of healing and exorcism, and the framework of eschatological intensity and of demonism and Satanism in which it is set give it a special character. The personal-ethical aspects in Jesus' consciousness are not to be under-estimated, but they are found in a charismatic matrix, as in the case of Isaiah, Paul and St. Francis. Are we not confronted with the fact that personal life is complex and lived at various levels psychologically? At one level, the highest perhaps, its relationships are conscious, rational, responsible, voluntary. At other levels the relationships of personality are unconscious, sacramental, charismatic. The most scrupulous personalist in religion, desirous of interpreting religion strictly as personal faith, and to worship "in spirit and in truth," falls into the danger of a merely cerebral piety unless he admits impersonal and supra-moral aspects of the religious life. Denial of overwhelming experiences of a mystical

character in prophetic religion results from an impoverished moralism, or a dogmatic emphasis on transcendence, or an arbitrary absolutizing of the distinction between *eros* and *agape*. It is arbitrary to deny to Jesus what is so universal in the religious life and especially in the religious life of the ancient world. Is it not the prepossession of a certain type of liberal Protestantism, tending to confine the dynamics of the religious consciousness to a prosaic voluntarism, which could ever have questioned it? Sobriety should not be viewed as the distinguishing feature of true prophecy.

NOTES

¹For example: Bundy, *Our Recovery of Jesus*, ch. V; Windisch, "Jesus und der Geist," in Case, *Studies in Early Christianity*, pp. 209ff; Cadbury, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*, pp. 177ff.

²*Story of Jesus*, ch. IV; also in Sneath, *Religion and the Future Life*, pp. 268ff.

³*Our Recovery of Jesus*, pp. 145, 295, 102.

⁴*The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, p. 340.

⁵"Jesus und der Geist," in Case, *Studies in Early Christianity*, p. 226.

⁶"The child-like confidence of Jesus towards God the Father always remains a personal communion; it never has its issue in a mystical union." (Heiler) This is true, but Heiler fails to inquire whether it may not issue in a mystical participation. The word "union" evades the question. "His goal is not a mystical union with the divine, but a moral harmony of life with the divine will." (Bundy). This is true, but again extreme alternatives alone are considered. "Le mysticisme de Jesus ne connaît pu'une union 'personaliste' de la volonté de l'homme avec la volonté transcendante de Dieu..." (Menegoz).

The God of My Father—A Study of Patriarchal Religion

HERBERT GORDON MAY

UNDER THE stimulus which comes from the study of the rich fund of comparative data, it is all too easy to give inadequate attention to the biblical materials in our interpretation of Hebrew religion, achieving a distorted perspective as the result of an over-emphasis on similarities and lack of attention to peculiarities.¹ A case in point is Alt's study of "the God of the Fathers," which suffers from too little attention to the biblical data.² Any effective answer to this problem must take more seriously the biblical materials.

J. Lewy has correctly recognized that two distinct formulae are concerned.³

These are radically distinct both with regard to date and meaning. They are "the God of My (Thy, etc.) Father," and "Yahweh, the God of Their (Your, etc.) Fathers." Besides these two, there are also concerned in our problem such expressions as "the God of Abraham," "the God (or Pahad) of Isaac," and "the God (or Abir) of Jacob."

The formula "Yahweh, the God of Their (Your, etc.) Fathers" is exilic and post-exilic in date. The preponderance of evidence is against an earlier date. In eleven of its occurrences it is due to the exilic Deuteronomic redactor.⁴ The Chronicler uses the expression twenty-nine times.⁵ and in Daniel the formula appears once.⁶ In contrast with these forty-one indubitable exilic and post-exilic occurrences, the formula appears only four times where some might doubt its late date, namely in the JE story of Moses and the burning bush in Ex. 3:13, 15, 16; 4:5, where there may actually be and probably is redaction or editing as late as the time of the Deuteronomist.⁷

The formula is here accompanied by the expression "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,"⁸ and at least once in this section, in Ex. 3:6, this expression is certainly a later expansion.⁹ Outside of Exodus 3 and 4, the expression "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" appears as the variant "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel" in 1 Chr. 29:18; 2 Chr. 30:6, and 1 Ki. 18:36 (cf 2 Ki. 13:23), which may hint a late origin for the expression.¹⁰

It is important to note a few characteristics of the formula "Yahweh, the God of Their (Your, etc.) Fathers." In its forty-five occurrences, the name "Yahweh" is missing only seven times.¹¹ The Chronicler uses the formula with the third person suffix twenty-one times,¹² with the second person suffix five times,¹³ and with the first person suffix but three times, and that in the plural.¹⁴ In only four of these twenty-nine instances does the suffix appear in the singular, and then always in the third person.¹⁵ The Deuteronomist, if we include the Exodus passages, employs the first person suffix but once,¹⁶ the second person suffix in the singular four times, but used collectively, the antecedent referring to the people Israel,¹⁷ the second person suffix in the plural six times,¹⁸ and the third person suffix four times, once being in the singular.¹⁹ All in all, the first person suffix is found only three times, and that never in the singular. It is obvious that the formula "Yahweh, the God of Their (Your, etc.) Fathers" was never a part of the individualistic (i. e. personal) religion of the biblical Hebrews.

We cannot be certain that this formula

always refers to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It certainly does in Exodus, and probably also in Deuteronomy, where it is associated most frequently with the promise to inherit the land. Yet in the later Chronicler's usage it may at times have had the significance of the God of the ancestors of the Hebrews, including the patriarchs and others. We may note particularly Daniel 11:13, where in the formula "fathers" obviously means ancestors in general, for it refers to the god of the "fathers" of Antiochus.²⁰

In contrast with the plural formula, the singular "God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" is obviously early and already archaic at the time of the JE writers. It appears in the J and E sources in Genesis eleven times.²¹ In Exodus it occurs three times, associated by tradition with Moses, but obviously used by the writers as an archaism.²² And that is all, for two apparent instances in Chronicles are not really parallel.²³ The weight of Hebrew tradition points in a surprising fashion to the patriarchal period as the time when the formula "the God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" was a part of living religious terminology.

In significant contrast with the later formula, the earlier "God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" is in no instance directly preceded by the name of the deity. The closest approach is in Gen. 32:10, where a scribe, in the light of the later formula, may have inserted a marginal note identifying "the God of My Father" with Yahweh, and the word Yahweh was later copied into the text in a rather awkward position, giving us "the God of my father, Abraham, and the God of my father, Isaac, Yahweh." In any case it is in contrast with the later form, in which the name of the deity was prefixed.²⁴ In Gen. 28:13, where at any rate we do not have the usual formula, Yahweh is prefixed (I am Yahweh the God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac), but the present text is awkward, since Jacob is speaking

and Isaac was his father, but the designation "father" is here attached only to Abraham and not to Isaac.²⁵ This normal omission of the name of the deity, more significant of course in the J source, and the very nature of the formula itself, gives rise to the conjecture that *Elohe* in our formula may have been used in patriarchal times in Canaan sometimes and possibly always without conscious reference to any particular deity in the pantheon. We may perhaps compare the manner in which the Egyptians of the Middle and Late Kingdom used the term "god" without any reference to a particular deity in the pantheon.²⁶ That "the God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" was identified with El Shaddai cannot be deduced from the parallelism in Gen. 49:25, where the formula is an obvious archaism to the writer, nor from the LXX interpretation of El Shaddai as $\delta \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma \sigma\omicron\nu$, etc., which is possibly based on this passage and on Gen. 17:8.²⁷

If "the God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" was not normally consciously identified with any of the named deities in the pantheon, it would perhaps have been easier to think of the formula as having reference to one's immediate parent. The implication of such an expression as "the God of Thy Father who helps thee" (Gen. 49:25) may have been "even as God helped thy father, so he helps thee." See also Ex. 18:4. In keeping with the personal attributes of this deity are the many allusions to "the God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" being with or to a person²⁸ with admonitions not to be afraid.²⁹ This is in strong contrast to the plural formula, which is used in contexts where there are allusions to national apostasy from or faithfulness to Yahweh,³⁰ promises with regard to national prosperity and the possession of the promised land,³¹ or in worship contexts, usually group worship.³²

In keeping with the attributes of "the God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" as a personal, intimate deity is the fact that, in

strong contrast with the later formula, the earlier formula appears with the first person singular suffix six times,³³ the second person singular suffix four times,³⁴ the second person plural twice,³⁵ and the third person singular and plural once each.³⁶ This contrast may be in part due to the nature of the contexts, but it is striking enough to have some significance. It is also normally clear that this singular formula is to be contrasted with the later formula in that it alludes specifically to the deity of one's immediate parent. This is obvious in Gen. 26:24 and 46:1,3, and probably intended in Gen. 31:5,29; 43:23; 50:17, where the name of the father is not mentioned. Though the present texts in Gen. 28:13; 31:42; 32:10 allude to another than the immediate parent, all are questionable, and may have originally alluded to the immediate parent.³⁷

It is probably the result of the interpretation by later Hebrew tradition which makes Abraham at no time use the expression "the God of My Father." In view of the later Hebrew belief that the God of Abraham was the same God as the deity worshiped by the later Hebrews, and that Terah, the father of Abraham, worshiped non-Hebrew deities (Josh. 24:2,15), Hebrew tradition could hardly represent Abraham worshiping the God of His Father without seeming to make him a pagan. That Abraham did historically worship a personal deity which he designated as "the God of My Father" is quite probable in the light of the appearance of the formula in the Old Assyrian texts, which certainly go back to a time as early as Abraham.³⁸

The singular formula was certainly an archaism at the time of the writing of our present text. Although it was interpreted by the Hebrew authors as an allusion to Yahweh, or to Elohim who later became known under the name of Yahweh, it was not until after it had been revised in the exilic and post-exilic periods that it could

become a part of the living religious diction under the form "the God of Their (Your, etc.) Fathers." The Ezra contexts are particularly significant for showing this process. But to the earlier writers, the singular formula is an archaism, and was reinterpreted to mean the God of the Patriarchs, identified with Yahweh. In Ex. 3:6 the tradition as to the originality of the singular formula must have been very strong for it to have been preserved here, where we would expect the plural, for to speak of "the God of your father" with reference to Moses is awkward, since there is obviously no specific allusion to the parent of Moses. In Ex. 15:2, where Moses and the Israelites (*sic!*) state that Yahweh is "my God, the God of My Father," the formula is an archaism, and not to be taken literally, but is interpreted with much the same meaning which was later to characterize the exilic and post-exilic formula. Also, in Ex. 18:4, where Moses names one of his children Eliezer, it is, he is made to say, because "the God of My Father has been my help in delivering me from the sword of Pharaoh." There is obviously no allusion to the father of Moses, and the author is using the formula as an archaism, reinterpreting it in the light of his own theology. Had the formula been a part of the living religious diction of the period of the Hebrew monarchy, we might perhaps expect to find it in some of the personal, individual Psalms.

There can be no doubt that expressions in the Old Assyrian texts like *Assur u il abika littula*, "May Ashur and 'the God of Your Father' bear witness," furnish a significant analogy to the patriarchal formula. At times the deity thus designated is unnamed, and at other times is specifically identified with the deity Ilabrat.³⁹

This latter is in apparent contrast with patriarchal usage, as we have seen. Lewy has done yeoman service in calling attention to these Old Assyrian parallels, where, incidentally, the formula contains "father"

always in the singular. By contrast, Alt's interpretation of "the God of the Fathers" in terms of the patriarchs as founders of specific cults, such as the cult of the God of Abraham, the Pahad of Isaac, and the Abir of Jacob, is based on late analogies in Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions. His position is weakened by the strong possibility that these expressions do not go back into the patriarchal period, and by the fact that the singular formula, "the God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" rather than "the God of Abraham," etc., is the more archaic. We have seen how in more than one instance the expression "the God of Abraham" is secondary in the sources, while the Pahad of Isaac appears only in Gen. 31:42, 53, the noun *pahad* being characteristically late, making it impossible to build too much upon it. The Abir of Jacob appears only in the poem in Gen. 49:24, and in exilic and post-exilic contexts, making it equally hazardous to use.⁴⁰ As the present writer has stated in another place, if Jacob instituted any cult, it was probably not that of a deity known as the Abir of Jacob, but the worship of the deity Bethel at Bethel.

Our conclusion may be briefly stated. Needless to say, in view of the lateness of our records, it must be very tentative. It is quite generally agreed that the patriarchs were polytheists. Along with their worship of certain named deities in the pantheon, such as El, Bethel, etc., the patriarchs in their personal religion thought of deity in close association with their immediate parent, speaking of deity, or a deity, as "the God of My (Thy, etc.) Father." Later tradition, not fully appreciating the significance of this terminology, used the formula to refer to the God of the patriarchs, which it identified with Yahweh or thought was to become known by the name of Yahweh. It was by this time, however, largely an archaic term. In the exilic and post-exilic periods the formula was changed, becoming "the God of Their (Your, etc.)

Fathers," and soon became a part of the living religious diction.⁴¹

NOTES

¹This has been pointed out in connection with the problem of Hebrew monotheism by W. C. Grahame, "Higher Criticism Survives Archaeology," *The American Scholar*, VII (1938), p. 423.

²A. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, Stuttgart, 1929.

³J. Lewy, "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament," *RHR*, CX (1934), pp. 29ff.

⁴It appears eight times in the Book of Deuteronomy, in 1:11, 21; 4:1; 6:3; 12:1; 26:7; 27:3; 29:24. All these are D₁, including 26:7, which appears in a context reminiscent of D₂; cf. 1:21 4:1; 27:3, where the formula is also used in a context concerning the possession of the promised land. The formula appears in 2 Ki. 21:22 and Judg. 2:12, in obvious Deuteronomistic passages, as is generally recognized. It is found in Josh. 18:3 in a Deuteronomistic redaction of a JE context. The hand of the Deuteronomistic redactor is generally recognized in verse 7, and there is nothing more Deuteronomistic in flavor than verse 3. For instance, compare "to possess the land which Yahweh the God of Your Fathers gave to you" with "and you shall possess the land which Yahweh the God of Your Fathers gave to you" in Deut. 4:1. Cf. also Deut. 1:20, 21; 27:3. Cf. H. Holzinger, *Das Buch Joshua* (1901), p. 73.

⁵1 Chr. 5:25; 12:17; 29:20; 2 Chr. 7:22; 11:16; 13:12, 18; 14:3; 15:12; 19:4; 20:6, 33; 21:10; 24:18, 24; 28:6, 9, 25; 29:5; 30:7, 19, 22; 33:12; 34:32, 33; 36:15; Ezra 7:27; 8:28; 10:11.

⁶Dan. 11:37, "For the God of His Fathers he had no regard", with reference to Antiochus Epiphanes. We should note in Jer. 50:7 the expression "the hope of their fathers, Yahweh," in the late-exilic oracle against Babylon: see G. Cameron, *History of Early Iran*, Chicago, 1936, pp. 222ff.

⁷See, for instance, J. E. Carpenter, *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, 1902, pp. 327ff.

We probably have here the same Deuteronomistic editing of JE documents as that which appears in Josh. 18:3 and Deut. 27. For Deut. 27 as a JE document with Deuteronomistic expansions, see S. R. Driver, *Deuteronomy, International Critical Commentary*, pp. 294ff.

⁸Ex. 3:15, 16; 4:5. Ex. 3:15ff. may be an expansion of verse 14, "Yahweh sent me (for 'I Am' sent me)" being expanded in verse 15 to "Yahweh, the God of Your Fathers . . . sent me." For possible evidence that we have here later expansions, compare the list of gentile nations in verse 17 with Deut. 7:1; 20:17; Josh. 9:1; 12:8; 11:3; 24:11; 1 Ki. 9:20, etc.

⁹See Lewy, *op. cit.*, p. 54 and Alt, *op. cit.* pp. 12f. The fact that the formula "Yahweh, the God of Their (Your, etc.) Fathers" never found its way into the Hebrew Psalms may be perhaps taken for what it is worth as an argument from silence as a hint that it was unknown in the pre-exilic period. It might be argued by the same token that the singular formula "the God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" is

Gabriel's Trumpet

S. VERNON McCASLAND

ONE DAY several years ago when I was lecturing to a class on I Thessalonians and giving a sort of running paraphrase of the passage about the coming of the Lord and the resurrection of the dead, which begins at 4:13, I caught myself saying that before the dead came from their graves the Angel Gabriel would descend and blow his trumpet. A feeling of embarrassment came over me as I realized that actually the passage does not say that Gabriel would be the trumpeter. So I began from that day to look for the origin of this popular belief. I dare say that if a hundred people today are asked who will sound the trumpet which is to wake up the dead, at least ninety-nine of them will say Gabriel without the slightest hesitation.

Our Negro spirituals are perhaps the best evidence of the popular view. They never tire of singing about Gabriel blowing his horn; and the belief has now been given a classic expression in Marc Connelly's *Green Pastures*, where Gabriel always carries his beloved trumpet about with him, eagerly fingering the instrument, and the Lord has to warn him to be careful not to blow too soon.

Thus, while the reader may not be inclined to pardon my error in introducing Gabriel into Paul's description of the rising of the dead he will at least be able to understand the psychology which caused me to make the mistake, and he will have to admit that my paraphrase was an accurate representation of present-day popular theology, whether it was correct from a Biblical point of view or not. For a number of years it was my

custom to offer an A on the term paper to any student who would find the origin of the belief. I have given A's on some of these papers because of general excellence in other respects, but never because the problem had been solved. All the time I too have been looking, but with only partial success. While I have cleared up some aspects of the problem, others still remain shrouded in mystery.

When it finally became clear to me that Paul does not mention Gabriel as the one who blows a trumpet, my first reaction was to suppose that surely the idea was either Biblical or that it could be traced to some other early Christian or Jewish document. But I went through all the Biblical, apocryphal, pseudepigraphic, patristic, and even the rabbinic writings, so far as they are accessible in translations, without finding the answer. Then I looked into the eschatology of both Zoroastrianism and Islam, for the kinship between the ideas about last things in the four religions named is well known. The religion of Zoroaster has exerted a decisive influence on all the others in their turn, so that they all have the same basic eschatological pattern, but with individual variations. There was thus the possibility that one might find Gabriel as trumpeter in all these religions. But this did not turn out to be the case.

The New Testament speaks with an uncertain voice about how the dead are to be raised. There are no less than five different ideas about it. Matthew 24:31 states that the Son of Man will descend and send his angels with a great trumpet blast to gather the elect from the four

winds. John 5:25-29 says the voice of the Son of God will call the dead from their graves. I Cor. 15:52 affirms merely that the trumpet will sound and the dead will rise. According to I Thess. 4:16, the dead will be raised by the shout of the archangel and the sound of God's trumpet. But in Revelation 8-11 the end comes after seven angels have sounded a series of mighty blasts. Thus the New Testament shows that the mind of the church was not then made up on the subject of the last trumpeter. In one passage God himself is the trumpeter; in two places a group of angels sound; in another it is the voice of the Son of God; and Gabriel is nowhere indicated by name. In I Thess. 4:16 where the shout of an archangel is mentioned, the trumpet is blown by God himself and, while the identity of this angel is not given, leading commentators, like Frame, Moffatt and Bousset, on the basis of Jewish beliefs of the time, think that he was Michael. All of this means that Gabriel cannot claim Biblical authority for his unique position.

It is well known that the trumpet had a prominent place in Judaism, where it was associated with festivals, war, the return of exiles, and the last judgment, but nowhere is the trumpeter identified as Gabriel. Michael is the angel most often associated with the resurrection and judgment. The Apocalypse of Moses 23:1-2 has Michael to sound a trumpet when the Lord is to pronounce judgment on Adam, and Daniel 12:1 f. connects Michael with the end. But more to the point are the Jewish view that the Lord himself will blow a trumpet to usher in his Great Day and to call the exiles home,¹ and the late rabbinic tradition that God will blow seven blasts to raise the dead.² The reading of Jewish sources did not answer my question about Gabriel, but it had the negative value of

indicating that this particular feature of eschatology was probably never Jewish at all and was a creation of Christianity itself.

A similar reference to Zoroastrianism had an equally negative result. In all its wealth of teaching about the last judgment, so far as I can discover, there is no trumpeter at all. Thus the picturesque conception of the trumpeter of judgment appears to be a creation of Judaism, just as the identification of Gabriel is the addition of Christianity. But the question remains, when did Christian thought make the identification?

Pursuing the idea into Islamic thought, we make two interesting discoveries. The last trumpeter is there all right and he is carefully identified, but the honor is given not to Gabriel but to Israfil!³ In the Koran itself the trumpeter is often mentioned but left anonymous, but there is no doubt about his identity in the later tradition. At the same time, Gabriel is the most prominent angel in Islam, where as the angel of revelation he has the same general function as in Judaism and Christianity. Michael is also prominent. Then there are Azrael, the death angel, and Israfil, whose definite assignment is to sound the last trump. What do these facts mean for our question about Gabriel? The answer appears to be obvious. When Islam arose about A. D. 600 and was borrowing its eschatology from Judaism and Christianity, Gabriel had still not been identified as trumpeter, so in the Koran the trumpeter is anonymous just as he is in the Bible. After A. D. 600 in Islamic tradition Israfil got the honor, even as Gabriel did in Christianity after the same date.

This result agrees with my study of the Christian sources. I have searched both early and late patristic writings and found only frequent repetition of the various Biblical allusions with never an identification of Gabriel as the trumpeter. A reading of the

eight century Cynewulf's *Christ* and Caedmon's poems and of the English miracle plays of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, all of which are steeped in theology of a none too classical type, where if ever one might expect to find Gabriel identified, gave only the same negative result. It may be accepted as reasonably certain that even at this late date, in English culture at least, the trumpeter was still anonymous.

But two centuries later, in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, published in 1667, we come upon the identification of Gabriel as trumpeter for the first time, I believe, in English culture. In Book xi. 72 f. occur these lines:

He ended, and the Son gave signal high
To the bright minister that watch'd, he
blew

His trumpet, heard in Oreb since perhaps
When God descended, and perhaps once
more

To sound at general doom.

The identification of the "bright minister that watch'd" is clear from iv. 545 f.:

Betwixt these rockie pillars Gabriel sat
Chief of the Angelic guards . . .

Outside of Milton and the spirituals I have not yet found any further documentation of the idea in English in either hymns or general literature. Did Milton get the idea from early American Negroes? Did they get it from him? Did the Negroes read *Paradise Lost*? Did they get the belief from the hymns of white people? If so, from

what hymns? Did Milton and the Negroes independently arrive at the belief?

It now seems probable that both of these last questions are to be answered in the negative. I have now come upon the identification of Gabriel as the last trumpeter in an Armenian illuminated manuscript dated A. D. 1455. In one picture Gabriel sounds his trumpet while the dead are getting out of their graves.¹ Thus in Byzantine art at least two centuries before the time of Milton the identification had been made. It seems probable that Byzantine art therefore holds the final answer. It may be that still earlier examples will be found as the history of this branch of Christian art becomes better known. In any case, I doubt that any example will turn up which is earlier than the rise of Islam. It is quite possible that the Armenian artist who illuminated the manuscript in question should have the honor of assigning this role to Gabriel. It remains to be shown how Milton got the idea and how it got into the spirituals, but it is probable that in some way the Armenians and Milton and the spirituals reflect a common tradition. In any case, regardless of what devious paths Gabriel may have followed in attaining his position, in Western thought at any rate, he has no rival to challenge his right to sound the trump of doom.

NOTES

¹Isa. 27:12-13; Zech. 9:14.

²H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, (Muenchen, 1922-28), Vol. III, p. 481.

³*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, IV, 617; V, 376.

⁴Manuscript No. 543, fol. 14, Walters Gallery, Baltimore, Md.; No. 28 in S. De Ricci: *Census of Mediaeval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, 1935, Vol. I.

The Curriculum of Religion at Colgate

HERMAN A. BRAUTIGAM

I

UNDERGRADUATE courses in religion at Colgate had their beginning in 1911.¹ In that year a teacher was employed who became Professor of Biblical Literature and continued in this post until 1934, teaching courses in biblical subjects and in comparative religion. The responsibility thus accepted for giving instruction in religion to undergraduates was further underlined in 1927 when the University began the reorganization of its curriculum. According to the Colgate Plan then inaugurated, the University was divided into Schools, each School having a related group of subjects as its province. Besides the division into Schools, the course of study was divided into two stages. The first stage, comprising the freshman and part of the sophomore years, was intended to provide a minimal general education and to give the student an opportunity to discover a special field in which he would concentrate as an upper class man. The course of study adopted for this first stage consists chiefly of survey or general courses in the several fields, conducted by the faculties of the corresponding Schools.

The University was thus faced bluntly with the question of the place of religion in this new scheme of things. The answer was the establishment of a survey course in philosophy and religion and the eventual combination of the Department of Philosophy and the Department of Religion into a School of Philosophy and Religion, on a schematic parallel with the Schools of Social Science, Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, etc. The survey course in philosophy and religion,

meeting four hours a week for one semester, thus came to constitute about one-seventh of the freshman's course of study. Nor was this the only result of the new plan for the curriculum in religion. In order to conduct a survey course for three hundred freshmen, or one hundred fifty each semester, staff members in philosophy and religion had to be added. This has meant an opportunity to expand the number of courses offered in both philosophy and religion. In addition to the survey the Department of Religion now offers courses in the Bible, in World Religions, in Contemporary American Religion and in Problems of Religious Thought.

II

The reasons advanced for giving religion a central place in the curriculum center in the simple thesis that religion is in fact a part of our cultural heritage in which a general education is expected to provide some orientation. A minimal acquaintance with our religious heritage was held to stand on a par with acquaintance, on a similar level, with the other fields of interest and other institutions that make up our culture. Literacy in the field of religion was considered just as central in a program of general education as for example, literacy in the history of political institutions, in the sciences or in secular literature.

This thesis, being admitted, pointed to the inclusion of special courses in religion, taught by teachers specially trained in the subject. Only in this way could the emphasis be made that religion was not to be regarded merely as a phase of history, an interesting type of literature,

a form of thought, to be handled incidentally by teachers and departments concerned with history, or literature or philosophy in general. By giving religion a central place in the curriculum its significance was acknowledged to be central; its manifestation not merely an adjunct to the movement of events or a minor form of the arts, but as seminal in character, the mover of events and "the mother of the Arts,"² and as such not to be submerged among sub-classifications of other subjects.

Moreover, it was felt that the chief value of the teaching of religion could be gained only by assigning to it an independent place in the course of study. The organization of education into courses, classified according to schools and departments, while practically necessary, lacks correlation and integration. Each department deals with its own division of material, and the specialist, engrossed in his subject, is apt to forget that the ideal for man's life is unity, perspective and the recognition of relations. Religion, on the other hand, has always claimed jurisdiction over the inclusive interests of man; it has been an expression of man's spirit in its search for wholeness and unity. In the various expressions of developed religions, men have affirmed the need for the unification of human interests and activities and for perspective in life—a need which specialization obscures. If this be the case, it would be tragic if religion itself were studied in incidental parts and fragments and not as a unity. Studied in fragments it could only illustrate the possibilities of analysis; studied as a whole, it can suggest the ideal of wholeness (personal integration and social dependence) for life and a basis for its realization.

III

The approach to the survey course in

philosophy and religion was from the first historical. Thus it began with a survey of primitive religion and passed on to a review of the Hebrew development and the life and teachings of Jesus. The next part was devoted to central Greek conceptions of nature and ethics, leading up to an illustrative examination of the rise of Christian thought in the Graeco-Roman world. For a number of years the reference to the mediaeval period was extremely sketchy, while the Renaissance and the rise of science were only casually referred to. The Protestant Reformation was always treated with respect if not with thoroughness. Once the Reformation was left behind, the remaining time was devoted to a discussion of contemporary religious problems.

There was some serious consideration of a suggestion to reorganize the course from the standpoint of contemporary problems but this proposal was deliberately rejected by the staff. When the content of the course was critically examined preparatory to a cooperative writing of a text book, the historical approach and the basic outline were retained, but an effort was made to fill in some of the great gaps such as the absence of material on Greek religion, the Renaissance, the rise of science, the Enlightenment, and idealistic philosophy. There was also a deliberate attempt to introduce more social philosophy and ethics, and to present a better picture of the influence of modern physical, biological and psychological science on both philosophy and religion.

It is fairly obvious that both tradition and deliberate planning have been operative in the development of this course. From the beginning the course might have been appropriately called an attempt to survey our religious heritage, and to interpret and evaluate that heritage in the

light of the present. Thus the usual division of the study of religion as phenomenological and philosophical was basic here. In trying to acquaint students with the facts of our tradition, we have emphasized the historical and cultural situations, as well as the probable personal experiences and needs, out of which religious and philosophical experiences have grown, and according to which their thought forms were determined. Professor E. E. Aubrey's³ description of liberalism as a method rather than a creed would apply to our approach. This method is first historical and then constructive. The historical phase consists of the attempt to discover the empirical situation out of which a traditional concept grew. The constructive phase is to suggest the continuity of the empirical basis of the tradition, and to explore the possibilities of its current intellectual expression.

While one can make a logical distinction between the phenomenology of religion and the philosophy of religion, between the historical and the constructive phases of liberalism, this should not force us into the attempt at always making this distinction in teaching. Frequently the most appropriate time for interpretation and evaluation is when the descriptive acquaintance is freshest. We, at any rate have found that, while our approach is broadly historical and chronological, we philosophize from the beginning and historicize to the end. If thought grows out of an empirical context then the record of experience requires thought for its understanding, and reconstruction in thought requires history and psychology for its relevance.

IV

In conclusion a brief assessment of the disadvantages and advantages of the survey approach is offered.

In the first place, there is the manifest disadvantage from which every survey course, in whatever field, must suffer. In seeking for breadth it must sacrifice depth. It must seek to cover a great body of material at the expense of thoroughness. There is a tremendous premium on the omission of details that usually are regarded as essential in historical study. Details can be used only in an illustrative function, and the treatment must be confined to central themes and high lights. There is little opportunity for training in method. The method by which scholars have won the results which are surveyed has simply to be assumed, or sketchily illustrated. One phase of this is the necessary neglect of primary sources and even of collateral reading in secondary works.

These difficulties have been summed up in the charge of superficiality. Thus in a review of our book,⁴ Professor Harold Larrabee has warned⁵

"that the dangers of superficial or hasty surveys are especially grave in philosophy and religion, owing to the almost irresistible tendency on the part of authors to substitute the condensed conclusions of philosophers and theologians for the activity of philosophizing on the part of the student. Often the more authoritative the expositor, the worse the effect on the student, to the extent that the latter's wisdom is verbal, borrowed, and unearned, rather than the fruit of his own laborious and intimate experience."

Over against these disadvantages, it may truthfully be said that the survey approach gives a much needed perspective which the traditional concern with thoroughness in a small area has tended to obscure. If Mortimer Adler's advice

on moving from the whole to the part in reading a book is sound, then the survey method is on the right track. One is not really prepared to profit from thoroughness in a part until the outlines of the whole have first appeared. The survey approach is in a sense merely the application of the principle that education should be general before it becomes particular, liberal before it becomes specialized, and that appreciation of its results may precede mastery of the techniques of scholarship.

As to the danger that students will get merely a verbal wisdom, borrowed and unearned, this cannot be denied. That it is even greater in survey courses than in more thorough work over smaller areas of material is true. But the danger can be exaggerated by critics and minimized by the teacher. We used to worry over the conflict between our desire to give a minimal cultural acquaintance with a vast body of material and the equally strong desire to promote independent thought. This conflict proved to be largely imaginary. We have found that assimilation does not in fact take place without thought. One may possibly learn certain matters by mere memory, but the contents of a survey in philosophy and religion are simply too great to be learned without insight. The student is forced to think, to employ perspective, to see relations, trends, and oft repeated patterns. Without this he is totally lost. So that the dilemma between assimilation and thinking is in our experience largely false.

In the second place, difficulties may be felt about the union of religion with philosophy in a single survey course. Professor Larrabee regards it as "a lamentable inheritance from the theological age of American higher education, doomed to early extinction." Others feel

that the emancipation of philosophy from religion has gone too far. Without wishing to limit the autonomy of philosophy, its historical union with religion is such as to justify the treatment of the two subjects together. The danger is indeed that religion will be treated in a fashion too intellectualistic and that philosophy will be considered chiefly as it bears on religious problems. But such intellectualism and lack of scope are not inherent in the survey approach. If what is wanted is neither a history of religion in abstraction from its intellectual environment nor a history of philosophy in abstraction from the motives that make philosophers but a significant acquaintance with the development of the ideas that we live by, then it is difficult to see how this could be accomplished without uniting religion and philosophy—with extended reference to science—in a single treatment. At least this union is pedagogically convenient—and we believe it to be also sound.

Indeed, if religion be correctly regarded as concerned with life as a whole, its function is like that of speculative philosophy. But religion is less intellectualistic than philosophy, and presents the quest for unity in concrete, living terms, a quest which philosophy pursues by intellectual method. In so far, then, that philosophy explores the relatedness of things, both facts and values, it explores the affirmations of religion. This is perhaps as good a justification as is needed for grouping religion with philosophy: the one is the living expression of the quest for unity; the other deals with the rational aspect of this quest. If courses in speculative philosophy are justified, courses in religion are justified no less. Since they both deal with the meaning and value of experience from an inclusive standpoint,

their combination in survey courses is appropriate.

In the third place, our program may be objected to on the ground that the introductory course is compulsory. Some may feel a difficulty about any compulsory courses, but we believe that a minimal general education should be compulsory to make the specialties of schools and departments safer for election. How is the student to choose wisely without some background of comparison? Others may fear that a compulsory survey in philosophy and religion may do the same sort of disservice to religion that compulsory chapel attendance is widely supposed to render. Happily, when this survey is only one of four that are compulsory for all freshmen, the stigma does not attach itself to any one course. Actually, these freshman survey courses are taken for granted, as part of the University plan to which students have committed themselves by matriculation.

Finally, it may be suggested that the survey course spoils the possible interest

of students in advanced courses in religion. There is no doubt that many lay this subject aside with relief when the course is over. But others find their interest in religion stimulated and eventually register for one or more of the advanced courses. While the enrollment in our advanced courses is not large by some standards, we enroll on an elective basis an average of more than twenty in each of our four advanced classes. It seems not improbable that the survey course acts as a source of student supply for the department of religion.

NOTES

¹Colgate University was founded to train Baptist ministers in 1819, and maintained a theological seminary until 1928.

²Hocking, W. E., *The Meaning of God in Human Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912), p. 14.

³*Present Theological Tendencies* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1936), p. 25 et seq.

⁴Bewkes, E. G., and others, *Experience, Reason and Faith: A Survey in Philosophy and Religion*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940.

⁵*Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. XXXVII (1940), No. 22, p. 615.

Christianity: An Inquiry Into Its Nature and Truth

REVIEWED BY GEORGE THOMAS

Professor Rall's book,¹ which was awarded the Fiftieth Anniversary Bross Prize in 1940, is a clear and readable statement of the nature of Christianity and a defense of its truth. In the Foreword, he tells us that there are two extreme positions which must be rejected: that of those "who give up the traditional faith, seek to salvage the moral idealism of Christianity and join it to social devotion" and that of those "who realize that the crucial matter in religion is faith in God, but in their defense of that faith tend to fall back upon traditional supernaturalism and authoritarianism" (vii). It is because of the "double character" and reference of Christianity that these extreme positions are possible. "On the one side, it brings to man something transcendent and absolute, the living and unchanging God. On the other, it is something empirical, a movement that belongs to time and takes place in history, whose life and thought, whose practices and institutions are marked by the imperfection and change that belong to all things human." The most distinctive thing about Professor Rall's interpretation is the resoluteness with which he seeks to keep in mind this "double character" of Christianity and by doing so to preserve the essence of traditional Christianity while at the same time making his peace with modern thought. Those who believe in a positive Christian liberalism will approve the spirit and purpose of his book.

The chief weakness of the book is its lack of philosophical rigor. A number of topics are touched upon too briefly and some difficult problems are disposed of too lightly; e. g., the problem history sets for

faith is solved in a dozen pages. The reason seems to be the fear of the author that technical discussions will be out of place in a book designed for "the religious reader," "the college student," and "the general reader." "It is time that the discussion of religion was taken out of the closets of philosophers and theologians into the open roads of life. The primary vocation of the theologian is not to write books for other theologians to read" (x). The present reviewer regards this as one of those dangerous half truths which have been responsible for our superficial analysis of theological problems in America. We have been so concerned with the practical effects and the democratic diffusion of religious ideas that we have sacrificed rigorous and profound thought to the clarity of the textbook and the best seller. A distinction must be made, of course, between the mediator of the theological thought of others and the independent theologian. Both have their functions, but they are different functions. Despite this weakness of his book, Professor Rall is able to say much that is significant as an independent theologian. This is due to the openness and balance of his mind and to his fine appreciation of what is essential in Christianity. His balance is best shown by the use he makes of the "principle of polarity" throughout. Polarity "means, not an opposition which leads to deadlock and stagnation, but a tension which is the spring of action and progress" (p. 26), since each of the opposing aspects of the duality "demands the other for its com-

¹Harris Franklin Rall, *Christianity—An Inquiry Into Its Nature and Truth*. New York: Scribner's, 1940. 363 pages. \$2.50.

pletion" (p. 27). Thus, there is a tension between the individual and the social, rest and activity, permanence and change, trust in God and moral effort, the otherness of God and His kinship with man. Christianity represents a synthesis in the case of each of these oppositions. Thus, the Barthian emphasis upon the transcendent otherness of God and the liberal emphasis upon His immanence in nature and man are both present in the Christian view of God as transcendent above the world as its Creator but at the same time immanent in it as redemptive Spirit.

What is essential in Christianity is not so much its "institutional" aspect but its "prophetic" spirit and insights. Professor Rall breaks decisively with the traditional supernaturalism and its dualistic conception of God as imposing His will irresistibly and from without. It is this, he thinks, which lies behind the authoritarianism of the "institutional" conception, in its Greek, Roman, and early Protestant forms. "Essential Christianity," in this conception, "is something objective and visible, established by a direct deed of God and as such absolute, infallible, and unchanging," whether the divine factor is identified with Church, Bible, creed, or a combination of these (p. 52). Despite its obvious appeal, this view must be rejected not only because "history nowhere shows the infallible and unchanging which this theory demands" but also because it leads to a "materialization" of religion (p. 56).

In the "prophetic" conception, "the divine is seen as the continuously creative Spirit, self-revealing, redeeming, coming to supreme expression in Jesus, but moving forward from him in a new fellowship and in the creation of a new humanity" (p. 57). This is not to be confused with "a subjective mysticism that cuts loose from history" (p. 59) and is based upon no definite revelation. Rather, it holds to a definite conception of God as a living God achieving his ends in

history; the supreme revelation of His redemptive love in the person of Christ; and a way of life based upon redemptive love under the rule of God. Its conception of nature and man is a high one: "With all its need and sin, there is a kinship between humanity and God, as between the cosmos and God" (p. 60). Finally, it lays stress constantly upon the indwelling Spirit as continually operative in the present as in the past (p. 61).

It may be thought that, in this synthesis of modern liberalism and traditional Christianity, it is the former which is given more weight. It is clear, however, that Professor Rall values deeply the Christian community, its tradition, and its life. Moreover, he insists upon the absoluteness, the originality, and the finality of historical Christianity. It is the life, the teaching, the death, in short, the total fact of Jesus which is the "creative center" of Christianity. In his teaching he brought a new idea of God as redemptive good will seeking out the sinner and a reverence for man as son of God in his truest nature. His life was one with his teaching and it was passed on through his followers to the world. But, though it is the Jesus of history who is made the center of Christianity and though there is little careful analysis of the problem of Christology, it is the Christ of faith, the revealer of God's redemptive love, who is the source of the absoluteness of our religion. The finality which is implied in this absoluteness, however, is not to be interpreted in narrow and static fashion. "No religion can be final which is not a growing religion . . . it is a great creative experience, and advance in knowledge and insight are of its very essence." What is needed is "change with constancy of direction" (pp. 78, 9).

Throughout the book this "prophetic" conception is defended as consistent with "the new world picture" suggested by science and philosophy and the outlines of a Christian philosophy of religion are sug-

gested. Though the new science does not "prove" the theistic position, it points in that direction. When the rational order of nature, the absolute demands of morality, and the religious experience of fellowship with God are also taken into account, sufficient grounds for belief in God are present. But Professor Rall is no rationalist in his attitude towards "proofs" of God. Our knowledge of God comes through tradition and through personal experience of various kinds, especially intuition of wholes with their meanings and values and fellowship with God. But he knows that what comes in this way is not certainty in the logical sense but certainty in the sense of conviction. In short, faith is absolutely indispensable. Though it arises out of insights of experience, it involves trust in those insights and practical commitment to them. Thus, it is not arbitrary, but it goes beyond reason. The section on "The Knowledge of God" is one of the best parts of the book, though its treatment of the *general* problem of knowledge is very slight.

The prophetic conception of religion stresses the ethical life. Jesus does not present us with an authoritative set of rules, but with "an ethics of the spirit, inner and free." Its ethic is absolute, for it is rooted in God's eternal and unchanging will. It is also definite, for "it is expressed concretely in the spirit of Jesus, as indicated in his life in relation with man, in his teachings, and not least in his death" (p. 264). What it gives us, in short, is not moral rules and social programs, but principles and attitudes exemplified concretely in a person. By these principles, Christians must pass judgment upon social institutions such as our competitive economy, though without attempting to indicate the exact means of their improvement. Above all, Chris-

tian ethics gives us a dynamic as well as a goal, a new spirit, a new faith and courage, a new heart. This is the authentic voice of the social gospel of prophetic religion.

Professor Rall does not accept the somewhat pessimistic doctrine of man which dominates the new orthodoxy, because of his strong sense of the creative, indwelling Spirit in human life. But he is not blindly optimistic. The new theism, he says, recognizes that the work of Creative Goodness in the world is "done slowly, through long processes of growth and at the cost of toil and struggle." But though God is limited by the nature of the creative redemptive process itself, Professor Rall rejects all dualistic explanations of evil as an essential part of the cosmos, whether as rooted in the nature of God or as due to a demonic power. Creation must be viewed "as an achievement by the finite as well as the deed of the Eternal, as demanding a world with a certain spontaneity and autonomy instead of an inert substance shaped by compelling force" (p. 117). Following this principle, we can see that the evils which weigh most heavily are incidental to the essential elements of a world where the highest good is to be attained. Thus, incidental to the freedom required for moral good is "the possibility and practical inevitability of sin." Resistance must be overcome, hence toil and struggle. Rational order and regularity are necessary for physical existence and higher achievement, though they often seem cruel and inexorable. Finally, in a social being solidarity is essential, though it brings with it the suffering of the innocent. But what we must never do is to rationalize evil away. The main task of prophetic religion is not to explain it, but to overcome it in humility and trust.

The Nature and Destiny of Man

REVIEWED BY JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN

THIS FIRST volume of Dr. Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures¹ is a historic contribution to Christian anthropology by an American theologian. Protestant writing on human nature, in this country, is usually concerned with passing value judgments upon "the nature of man." Since the days of the Calvinist-Unitarian controversy on the subject, that is, since the middle of the eighteenth century, religious writers have wrangled about the amount of good and evil in man. Some have maintained "the essential goodness" of man, some his essential wickedness, and others, especially lately, the essential ambiguity of his nature. Man has been either maligned or flattered according to a theologian's dogmatic interests, or personal temperament, or degree of his ability to think, or according to supposed pedagogical necessity. The whole discussion of human nature has been a swing from cynicism to romanticism, back to moderate cynicism. In the meanwhile, little light has been shed upon the deeper roots of good and evil among men. While the human mind, or will, or emotions, in short the *psyche* of man, have been studied scientifically and assiduously, the spirit of man has been neglected, and we have argued without understanding. We have simply *felt* one way or another about "human nature," and taken sides either with "the liberals" or with "the Barthians."

Reinhold Niebuhr, with his usual unwillingness to acquiesce in a simple and superficial view of a question, with his usual diligence in the use of an acute mind and courageous honesty in facing facts, and with the help of unorthodox but great minds, like Kierkegaard, has broken through the common pattern of anthropological discussion

and given us a Christian *pneumatology* which takes us out of our present "blind alley" and places us on the road to genuine progress towards a proper understanding of human nature. His book is a tremendous effort to discover the essential man, expressing himself in the several aspects of his behaviour: mental, volitional, emotional, physical. Underlying the phenomena of our *microcosmos* discovered by psychological analysis, there is the human *spirit*, which is confronted with the problem of his destiny in his environment. The *psyche* is preoccupied with meanings in the environment. The *spirit* is concerned with "the meaning of life." The former is interested in things and goods—it is impersonal and impersonalizes its environment. The latter is the person and faces his environment, viewing its things and goods in relation to personal destiny. The former lives in space, the latter lives in time. The former is what we have in common with the beasts, the latter is our differentiating nature as human beings.

A close and receptive study of this book will be of great help to the student of the Bible. The truth is that in spite of much progress in "the historical study" of the Bible, the biblical man has become a strange and incomprehensible being for us. The utter seriousness and attention with which the biblical man confronts God, his constant anxiety about his future and destiny, his breathless inquiry concerning the mind and will of God, his persistent rebellion against the law of God setting bounds to his life, his repentance and joy in God, have become in-

¹*The Nature and Destiny of Man. I. Human Nature.* By Reinhold Niebuhr. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941. 306 pages. \$2.75.

comprehensible to us who have learned to ignore the *spirit* of man, and are preoccupied with the *psyche* and its functions instead. Hence we have "reinterpreted" the biblical conceptions of sin and deliverance according to our own indifference to destiny, and shut the book tightly closed for ourselves and for those we teach. The vision of man's profound disquietude in this world, and the permanent temptation to rebellion which life offers to a human being having been lost, the early legends of the Bible, the patriarchal stories, the narratives of the Exodus, the history, law and prophets of Israel, their hymns and wisdom literature, have become essentially unintelligible. The question of man in the Old Testament being thus dissipated, the answer, the Gospel given us in the New is become a matter of less than absolute consequence. A man who is not anxious knows no need for the "Word of God." One who has no ultimate question to ask, expects no ultimate answer, and cannot understand those who do. A rediscovery of the anxiety of the human spirit is a primary necessity for understanding the Bible, and Reinhold Niebuhr will be a great help to one who studies his version of it.

Unlike Emil Brunner and the common run of the "neo-orthodox," Dr. Niebuhr sets himself to understand man rather than judge him. As against Brunner's *Man in Revolt*, which is a devastating judgment on man the rebel, Niebuhr's book is an acute analysis of "man's rebellion against God." Man does not sin against God simply because he is bad. Sin has its roots in a malady of the spirit which Niebuhr calls, following Kierkegaard, anxiety.

Man "is anxious about both the end toward which he strives and the abyss of nothingness into which he may fall. The ambition of man to be something is always partly prompted by the fear of meaninglessness which threatens him by reason of the contingent character of his existence.

His creativity is therefore corrupted by some effort to overcome contingency by raising precisely what is contingent to absolute and unlimited dimensions. When anxiety is conceived it brings forth both pride and sensuality. Man falls into pride, when he seeks to raise his contingent existence to unconditioned significance; he falls into sensuality when he seeks to escape from his unlimited possibilities of freedom, from the perils and responsibilities of self-determination, by immersing himself in a 'mutable good,' by losing himself in some natural vitality" (pages 185, 186).

Such pride and sensuality are inevitable. They are born of that anxiety without which man cannot exercise freedom. The actual man sins as sparks fly upward. Confronted with nothingness and meaninglessness, man rebels and creates, creates and rebels. It is foolish to overlook the conjunction of "temptation and sin," and to judge man as though he sinned where he is not tempted. To understand the sinner is a primary condition of Christian wisdom. And yet, there is no necessity whereby man yields to temptation. Anxiety does not cause sin as a fire causes heat. Niebuhr repudiates any idea of "original sin" which compromises the responsibility of every sinner.

"The actual sin is the consequence of the temptation of anxiety in which all life stands. But anxiety alone is neither actual nor original sin. Sin does not flow necessarily from it. Consequently the bias toward sin from which actual sin flows is anxiety plus sin. Or, in the words of Kierkegaard, sin presupposes itself. Man could not be tempted if he had not already been saved" (pages 250-251).

Man is a deep. His spirit does not lend itself to any unilateral explanation. Sin and anxiety are related to each other dialectically. In our discourse on human nature we must be determinists and believers in free will, recognizing that the spirit transcends, in his life and career, all the psychic

phenomena which can be perceived, analyzed, and described. The living reality of the spirit, which we recognize so unmistakably in the life of the biblical man, and consequently in ourselves, confronts the mind with the paradoxes of "original righteousness" and "original sin," of anxiety which is at once a disease and a sin, of faith in God which is at once the anxious and trustful. We cannot but be grateful to Dr. Niebuhr for the incisive, profound and stimulating analysis of the human situation which St. Augustine long ago called "embarrassing." If it is true, as Calvin observed, that true piety is impossible without self-knowledge, Dr. Niebuhr has made an invaluable contribution towards the increase of faith in our time. We shall wait impatiently for the second volume of the lectures where he will discuss God's answer to the human problem.

In this review we have tried to go to the heart of the matter, especially as related to biblical study. We have not been able to

give any adequate impression of the tremendous labor that has gone into the making of the book, of the author's often judicious expositions of classical Greek and Christian thinkers (with certain exceptions such as Plato, Luther and Kant) as well as of modern writers who have been giants in our time, (e. g., Freud, Marx, Nietzsche, and Kierkegaard), and of the vitality which the author injects into many a hackneyed topic in theology and ethics. We also might have made critical remarks upon certain secondary material in the book, such as Niebuhr's conceptions of revelation, the orthodox doctrine of depravity, and "the Person of Christ" (pages 145-146).

We prefer to close this review saying that in our judgment this is the most profound and illuminating book on "human nature" in contemporary Christian literature, and that everyone earnestly and seriously concerned with the problem of "the good life" in our time should read it and ponder upon it until he "gets" it.

EDITORIAL

What Degree of Relativism?

War is having the effect of a strong catalytic upon the thinking of Christians, particularly with reference to the applicability of the teachings of Jesus. The reaction in certain circles is strongly in the direction of relativism. The leader of this movement has been Reinhold Niebuhr, author of the somewhat ambiguous and much-quoted interpretation of Jesus' teaching of love as "an impossible possibility," but a similarly relative position has been adopted by numerous other Christian leaders, many of whom regarded themselves as absolute pacifists until recently.¹ One is moved to inquire into the implications of this trend toward a relativistic interpretation of the teachings of Jesus. How relatively may those teachings be interpreted and still be regarded as normative for Christians? More specifically, as concerns the war issue, is there any stopping-point between the interpretation of Jesus' teachings as relatively absolute and the practical dismissal of those teachings as absolutely relative?

In the attempt to think through this problem it may be helpful to list some of the different varieties of interpretation in a scale ranging from the absolute on the one hand to the extreme relative on the other hand. In doing this, we shall make use of certain classifications adopted by Professor Julian Price Love in an article entitled, "Current Attitudes Toward The Teachings of Jesus," published in the August, 1939 JBR, making one or two minor changes in order to bring out more clearly the variety of emphasis in different interpretations. At one extreme may be placed (1) *The Attitude of Ready Acceptance*. This is the attitude of uncriti-

cal optimism regarding the applicability of Jesus' teachings, with which Reinhold Niebuhr identifies liberal Christianity and the "social gospel" movement. (2) Here we may place Professor Love's preference for "*A Hopeful Attitude*," which may be summarized in the following sentences: "... the *sphere* of the living in this ethic must be something else than the 'world.' . . . Call it what you will,—the church, the Christian community, the Christian fellowship,—it is that inner circle of like-minded people with whom and toward whom we not only may, but many actually do, live the ethic of Jesus." (3) *The Attitude of the Eschatologist*. Professor Love identifies this position with the "Interimsethik." Since Martin Dibelius, for example in his new book, *The Sermon on the Mount*, clearly disavows this identification in his exposition of the meaning of eschatology, we shall list separately: (4) *The Interpretation in Terms of Interim Ethic*, as illustrated in the writings of Albert Schweitzer. (5) *The Neo-Realistic Attitude of "An Impossible Possibility"*, as expounded by Reinhold Niebuhr. (6) What Professor Love has described as "*The Attitude of the Beautiful Dream*," which he illustrates with the frequently heard way of dismissing Jesus' teachings: "O, the sayings of Jesus about turning the other cheek or not hating in your heart are a beautiful pattern for life, but they really aren't practical."

Let us examine these different attitudes, reserving especial attention for the views of Reinhold Niebuhr and Martin Dibelius, whose writings are exerting considerable influence at the present time. It is no doubt

true that some interpreters of the first-listed position have been guilty of an "Over-ready Acceptance," have assumed an attitude of superficial optimism regarding the applicability of Jesus' teachings. They have failed to take into account the full extent of human evil, the tendency toward sin. Yet we should remember that this charge comes from those who seem committed to a doctrine of human depravity which is in itself one-sided and fails to take into account the potentialities of human nature for good. It remains to be proved that a "realistic" pessimism regarding human nature will accomplish more in the direction of fruitful personal and social change than a sober-minded optimism. The "Hopeful Attitude," preferred by Professor Love, seems to us to run the risk of admitting a sacred-secular dualism, which might have the effect of encouraging withdrawal from worldly evil, although Professor Love takes this into account by saying "the world will more readily 'repent,' will more frequently change its ways, by seeing the example of a Christian fellowship intensively living the life of Jesus than by all the efforts of an ecclesiastical organization to force righteousness extensively on the world." We are not convinced by Schweitzer's "interim-ethic," with its implication of the irrelevance of Jesus' eschatological sayings for our age. Martin Dibelius criticizes Schweitzer by saying: "much as we owe to Albert Schweitzer for his eschatological interpretations of the gospels, we dare not follow him in construing them as the expression of an 'interim-ethic.' These commandments were given not for the short time intervening between the present and the end of the world. They were given for eternity, because they represent the will of the eternal God."² "The Attitude of the Beautiful Dream" hardly requires discussion, although, no doubt, widely entertained in the popular mind. It is a position not founded upon thought, but reflecting at second hand the

tendency toward relativism expressed in other attitudes we shall consider.

Theoretically, Reinhold Niebuhr argues in part for the *relevance* of the law of love. He speaks of "the *possibility* of an impossible ethical ideal" as well as of its "*impossibility*." "The prophetic tradition in Christianity must insist on the relevance of the ideal of love in the moral experience of mankind on every conceivable level. . . . While the final heights of the love ideal condemn as well as fulfill the moral canons of common sense, the ideal is involved in every moral aspiration and achievement."³ Thus, the love ideal has the relevance of a frame of reference for and a basis of judgment upon everyday living. In actual practice, however, Niebuhr places chief emphasis upon the irrelevance of Jesus' teaching in the present war crisis. His pamphlet, "Why the Christian Church is not Pacifist," is said to have been widely circulated in England in support of recruiting for the British armed forces. This example may serve to raise the question whether a middle ground can be found between a relatively absolute and an absolutely relative interpretation of Jesus' teaching.

Like Niebuhr, Martin Dibelius, in his newly-published book, *The Sermon on the Mount*, gives a strong theoretical argument for the relevance of the teachings of Jesus. "To have a Christian faith today means to be convinced that in spite of everything, the Christian message actually has redeeming force and significance for mankind. . . . If anything, we are inclined to feel that the Christian message has not yet been fully interpreted, that the treasure of the Gospel has not yet been exhausted" (pp. 4, 5). Yet Dibelius seems to find no reference in Jesus' teachings to the problem of international war, if we understand him correctly: "What is the meaning of these commands (in the Sermon on the Mount)? We start with the great command to love one's enemies. We must not seek to escape from the full

weight of the problem by supposing that, when Jesus here speaks of an enemy, he means first and foremost the national enemy. . . . No, in this word about loving one's enemy Jesus is apparently thinking of private enemies . . . " (pp. 54, 54). This interpretation of the command to love one's enemies is startling when one remembers that in the first chapter of this same book, Dibelius lists as one of the two great defeats of Christianity in modern times its "failure to prevent war with its hatreds, its devastations and its unsatisfactory 'peace' treaties . . . " (p. 2). This type of argument for the relevance of the Sermon on the Mount may as well be regarded as an argument for its irrelevance.

Yet Dibelius' book contains some very valuable suggestions for the understanding of Jesus' teaching. In one respect, it offers a corrective for Reinhold Niebuhr's interpretation of the purpose of Jesus' use of absolutes. Niebuhr states that the absolutism of Jesus' teaching is intended to demonstrate to his disciples their human incapacity. "The love commandment stands in juxtaposition to the fact of sin. It helps, in fact, to create the consciousness of sin."⁴ This view Dibelius rejects, branding it as Pauline. He finds another solution. "This solution, it seems to me, must be based upon the understanding of Jesus' words and deeds as *signs of God's kingdom* (italics his). Jesus proclaims the pure will of God. He proclaims it by giving some radical examples of what God demands, but he does not describe the full application of God's demand to this world."⁵ The book also provides a clear warning against literalism in the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. "The Christian must live and act. What he needs is a standard and not a description of his daily life. He looks on the New Testa-

ment to discover not what precisely to do, but how to act."⁶

We find the suggestion of a conclusion for our own thinking in a summarizing statement of Dibelius, when he says that two things follow from the recognition of the absolute quality of Jesus' demands: (1) the inability of human beings to obey them completely, and (2) *the necessity of obeying them to the extent of our present capacity here and now* (italics ours). No one, whether absolutist or relativist, can with justification deny the truth of either of these statements. Yet to our way of thinking, the premise that needs to be stressed at the present moment is the second. We agree heartily with the words with which Dibelius continues: "The Sermon on the Mount *must be taken seriously* as an expression of the divine will—even in this world" (italics ours).⁷ The crucial issue in the present controversy over the practicability of the teachings of Jesus concerns *how nearly* we shall attempt to approximate the spirit of those teachings. Many current interpretations of Christian ethics do not seem to us in any sense to approximate those teachings. Is not the trend toward an ever more relativistic interpretation of the teachings of Jesus a trend away from adherence to them?

C. E. P.

NOTES

¹See article entitled, "The Flight of Moral Leadership," in *The Christian Century*, June 25, 1941.

²Martin Dibelius, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 97, 98.

³Reinhold Niebuhr, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, pp. 104-105.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁵Martin Dibelius, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 129-131.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 101-102.

BOOK REVIEWS

Theology

Christian Realism. By JOHN BENNETT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941. xiii + 198 pages. \$2.00.

Professor Bennett's latest book is an objective and clarifying survey of a liberal position. The general topics discussed are God, man, society, and redemption.

The book is free from all straining at novelty. It is a calm and reasoned confession of faith for the times. In spite of its spiritual seriousness, it is perhaps a little too calm, at least on the philosophical side. The problem of evil, it is true, is faced very frankly, and Professor Bennett, aware of his differences from the Calvinistic position (as set forth in Joseph Haroutunian's *Wisdom and Folly in Religion*), affirms that the fact of evil leads to the conclusion "that God, because of his own nature, faces limited possibilities." This just conclusion is less cogent than it would be if supported by a more explicit metaphysic and epistemology. Professor Bennett is so pre-occupied with current social and moral problems that the cosmic aspects of religion and the problematic relations between religion and science receive scant attention.

The chief contribution of the book is its presentation of the Christian case against pacifism. Professor Bennett's tone is notably less strident, more rational, and more repentant than that of many theological interventionists. Thoughtful pacifists may well agree with his point that "pacifism is not the only decision open to the Christian who seeks to be sensitive and obedient." Even on this grave issue, Christians may differ honestly. Likewise, most pacifists will agree that mere passive reliance on the inevitability of the triumph of right is not

enough; evil must be resisted. Pacifists will, however, judge that Professor Bennett does not give sufficiently critical attention to the question whether military resistance is likely to be more effective than spiritual resistance at the present juncture. He does not give sufficient weight to the actual long-run effects of military resistance from 1914 to 1918—effects manifest at Versailles, in the blockade of Germany, inflation, worldwide depression, and the rise of totalitarianism. He does not face imaginatively and fundamentally enough the question: Is there no better way to cope with the disease of our civilization than the way of violent resistance? Can Christians offer no better policy than the War Lords pursue?

It is indeed the duty of pacifists to be constructive, creative, positive. Yet Christian interventionists might well search their hearts for the ground of their assurance that the way of war is itself likely to be constructive, creative, positive in its outcome.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Boston University

A Preface to Christian Theology. By JOHN A. MACKAY. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. x + 187 pages. \$2.00.

In these Sprunt lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, in 1940, the president of Princeton Theological Seminary voices a call for the return to theology. "The mood of quiet desperation that marks our time, the many-sided quest of the modern mind for meaning and authority, make Christian theology our most crucial need" (p. 19). What we need is not an apology for religion but theology centered in Revelation as its concern and its content. Revelation as it is here in-

tended means special revelation, found uniquely in the Bible as the Word of God. This is neither fundamentalism nor modernism. "It is always possible," Dr. Mackay declares, "to 'believe the Bible from cover to cover,' without uncovering the truth it contains. It is equally possible to know the historic truth regarding the documents that make up the Bible and egregiously fail to hear the voice of the Eternal in Biblical history" (p. 67). The Bible must be understood as the Word of God in the sense that the great Reformers understood it.

Revelation cannot be apprehended by those who approach it merely as spectators from the balcony. The Word of God comes only to those who approach it as pilgrims on the road of "first-hand experience of reality where thought, born of a living concern, issues in decision and action" (p. 44). No person will ever come to know the ultimate truth who does not turn from the question of what things are in their essence to the question of what they should be in their concrete existence. The crucial question for gaining knowledge of God is, "What must I do?" And the answer is found only by the encounter of sinful man with Jesus Christ, at once the embodiment of grace and the object of faith. Jesus Christ is "personal truth," the unique Incarnation of God and the agent of Redemption. The Incarnation was an event in history so unique and so momentous in character that it was discontinuous with anything that preceded it. This divine drama is the pivot of history and alone makes it intelligible. As the personal encounter with Jesus Christ gives birth to a special quality of personal and corporate life, the Incarnation provides the clue to God's unfolding purpose as the background to Christian ethics and the nature and function of the Church.

No brief summary can do justice to this arresting restatement of the Pauline-Augustinian conception of the Christian religion, a conception made orthodox by the Reform-

ers and recently revived in vigorous fashion by Karl Barth and others. The happy circumstances that Dr. Mackay writes out of a background of wide experience and reading, and brings the skill of the experienced preacher and teacher to the presentation of his materials, make his book readable, instructive and persuasive. His analysis of our human situation and needs, and his discussion of Christian ethics, must be granted a large measure of validity even by those who, like this reviewer, cannot accept the theological base from which the author operates.

The distinction between the balcony and the road as symbols for the spectator and the wayfarer approaches to truth is perhaps the crucial part of the book. Reminiscent of Augustine's dictum that belief is a condition for understanding Christian truth, Dr. Mackay's rejection of the spectator approach in favor of the practical approach to truth has more in common with the absolute pragmatism of Fichte than with the experimentalism of Dewey. The author's activism appears to be cut off both from the possibility of criticism which the perspective of the balcony alone affords, and from the checks of the scientific method which true pragmatism preserves. To hold that the crucial question in religion is, "What must I do?" is probably useful and proper for evangelism, but it would seem to be fatal for a theory of religious knowledge. Meeting the quest for knowledge by the command to obey is really an appeal to authority. As such it has no criterion for choosing one authority over another.

The emphasis on transcendence, the denial of historical continuity, the appeal to the authority of special revelation—these are parts of the attempt to get beyond the limitations of our human standpoint. But it does not appear that such an attempt can possibly succeed. For instance, to escape Biblical literalism, the crisis theologians, with whom Dr. Mackay may now be identi-

fied, actually interpret the Word of God in terms of certain *experiences* (p. 67). To exempt *these* experiences from rational analysis, criticism, and interpretation is dogmatism. To subject them to such procedures is the very human method of rational empiricism which the crisis theology seeks to transcend.

HERMAN A. BRAUTIGAM

Colgate University

Faith of the Free. Edited by WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1940. 276 pages. \$2.50.

Dr. Edward Scribner Ames completed a forty year ministry of the University Church of the Disciples of Christ (Chicago) in October, 1940. This book is a symbol of gratitude offered to Dr. Ames at that time by twenty-three present and former members of his congregation. Among the contributors are professors of economics, history, philosophy, physics, religion, and sociology; ministers of churches; an architect; a director of libraries; a director of a Farm Foundation; a director of music; a writer; an editor; a general secretary of religious education.

Dr. Ames has been a devotee of the viewpoint that secular values and sacred values cannot be separated, that "a religious value is always some other kind of value." The contributors to this volume agree with such a thesis, impressing their readers that pragmatic religion saturates every segment of experience. It is this common agreement on values which unites the rather diverse group of topics discussed by the co-authors.

A few of the topics and their writers will give one a feel of the book's direction and comprehension: William C. Bower analyzes "A Functional Concept of Religion"; Arthur E. Murphy explains "An Applied Philosophy of Religion"; Marguerite Harmon Bro views "Religion and Social Action"; Charles C. Morrison relates "A Free

Church beside a Free State in a Free Society"; T. V. Smith looks into "Conscience and Politics"; Henry K. Holsman describes "The Architecture of a Free Church"; S. Vernon McCasland clarifies "The Authority of the New Testament"; Samuel C. Kincheloe depicts "Living City Churches"; Herbert L. Willett evaluates "The Ecumenical Ideal"; Winfred E. Garrison interprets "The Liberal Heritage." At the end of the book Edward A. Henry compiles a bibliography of Dr. Ames' writings.

Reading this book made me realize that Dr. Ames has had an unusual congregation, whom he has affected deeply, but who in return must have been a stimulus to him as Sunday after Sunday he reflected upon what he should say from his pulpit to an extraordinary congregation. He and they must have been a splendid stimulus to one another. I remember one Sunday morning hearing Dr. Ames preach on "What I Believe," in which he said about immortality, "I believe that man is worthy of long remembrance." His hope for immortality is partially fulfilled in this volume, which will give to a great philosopher-preacher "long remembrance" to later generations who will pick up this volume.

Some readers of this book will feel that the "faith of the free" has forgotten rich and meaningful theological concepts due to this concentration on the present religious-sociological scene. They will discern that the liberal thinker, who has cut off historical tradition, lacks a kind of depth often associated with conservative theology. But I hope that such readers will also be aware that this book points clearly ahead to the road which religion must take, if it is to be a panacea for a socially distorted civilization.

Dr. Ames should be gratefully happy to number these contributors among his "disciples".

THOMAS S. KEPLER

Lawrence College

The Christian's Knowledge of God. By W. W. BRYDEN. Toronto: The Thorn Press, 1940. 266 pages. \$2.50.

The theme of this book might well be called the absoluteness of the Christian's knowledge of God in contrast with the relativity of all other kinds of knowledge. The word absolute occurs with great frequency all through the book. The general point of view is that of the Barthians and the book might be regarded as a mild American version of that European theology. The style is simple and the book is readable. It can be read with profit by anyone who is trying to think through the problems growing out of the relation of reason to faith in the Christian religion.

The author first shows us the blind alleys into which historical Biblical criticism has led the theologians by causing them to attempt to substitute historical facts and literary phenomena for divine revelation. In a similar vein he shows up the philosophers for causing us to think that revelation has something to do with the achievements of man's reason and the ethical and esthetic attributes of his character. On the contrary, he holds, revelation is the absolute word of God. The Word should always be capitalized. It is God's eternal Logos, which was made known by unique acts of God recorded in the Bible, in particular the incarnation, and God's living Spirit witnesses to this absolute revelation in the heart of man. There is no particular difference between Christianity and the ethnic religions in respect to morality and human values, but these qualities in Christianity have nothing to do with revelation. So non-Christian religions have no value whatever so far as revelation of God is concerned. Those writers who admire the religious qualities of Hinduism and Buddhism, for example, are misleading the devotees of these religions and also their Christian readers. No bridge can be laid from Christianity to Paganism. The absolute revelation of the Bible is the

judgment of God on natural man, in which the utter bankruptcy of human nature at its best is forever demonstrated, and man is brought into contact with the utterly free grace of God in Christ. Therefore, away with all philosophy, ethics, esthetics, progress, idealism, and especially with the empirical study of the Bible and religion.

But as I read this interesting book, I could not help wondering how I with my very finite mind could receive and comprehend an absolute revelation even if God really offered it to me, for it appears to me that my relative power to comprehend must necessarily put me beyond the pale. So far as I can see, all my grasp of revelation is by means of a mind, which, it requires no real humility on my part to admit, must be almost infinitely removed from the absolute. Then, too, if Biblical revelation has nothing to do with ethics and moral ideals, I keep wondering why the divine Word included such things in the Bible as the Ten Commandments, the Prophets, and the Sermon on the Mount. Could it be that the Lord had not at the time made up his mind as to the nature of absolute revelation? Come to think of it, so far as I recall, the word "absolute" is much less frequent in the Bible than such terms as justice, humility, mercy, and love, words for which nineteenth century scholarship had a great fondness but which in some circles today are in disrepute. In fact, I should be glad if some of the authorities on the absoluteness of Biblical revelation would send me a list of all the passages in the Bible where the word "absolute" occurs.

S. VERNON McCASLAND

University of Virginia

Can We Keep The Faith. By JAMES BISSETT PRATT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941. 218 pages. \$2.75.

The author of the magnificent books on *India and Its Faiths* and *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism*, familiar to all teachers of the

history of religions, here turns his attention specifically to the Christian tradition. While this book does not have the scope of those just mentioned, because written for a different purpose, it does benefit from the wide range of the author's interests and scholarly investigations. He is able to bring to bear upon consideration of the fate of Christianity in this period of rapid change the fruits of his study of other religions. "With these examples before us (Vedic religion, Indian Buddhism, the religions of Rome, Greece, and Egypt), and in view of the rapid and serious changes we are witnessing within Christianity, we may well ask ourselves whether our religion is going through what might be called the transformation of absorption such as we have seen in Indian Buddhism, the transformation of death such as befell the religions of Egypt and Greece, or the transformation of rebirth and newness of life that we trace in the growth and conservation of the Vedic religion" (p. 22).

This volume is peculiarly interesting because of its semi-autobiographical flavor. Professor Pratt states in the Preface that the idea of writing a book on this subject first came to him thirty-five years ago at the beginning of his career. "I was then at the beginning of my work as a college teacher; and looking forward, I planned that at the close of my career I should sum up, in perhaps my last book, what the reading and thought and experience of a lifetime should have taught me concerning the religious tendencies of our years, and the prospects of Christianity in the years to follow. . . ." (v). This personal note recurs throughout the book and lends it warmth and heightened interest for the reader.

Chapter XIII, which is given the heading of the book itself, "Can We Keep the Faith?", states the central problem of the book in terms of two queries: "whether the Christian faith is philosophically tenable and whether the retention of it by future generations is probable" (p. 176). Dr. Pratt pro-

fesses no great concern with regard to the tenability of the Christian faith. Among the leading metaphysical systems, extreme naturalism or materialism alone is incompatible with Christianity, and, to quote the author, "in view of the difficulties which naturalism has to face, I do not think the Christian need to feel crushed by this incompatibility" (pp. 185-186). The position of the extreme naturalist is essentially a dogmatic one. He must execute a *tour de force* to maintain that there are no events but physical ones and no real beings but material ones, the chief obstacle being the fact of mind and its manifestations.

We *can* keep the Christian faith, Professor Pratt believes, and proceeds to show the reasonableness of the Christian philosophy in successive chapters dealing with such topics as "What Is Christianity?", "Does Christianity Need the Christian Symbol?", "Authority—How Firm a Foundation", "What Is the Place of Reason in the Christian Faith?", "What Is the Christian Faith about God?", "What Is the Christian Faith about Man?", "What Is the Christian Faith about Religious Knowledge?", "What Is the Christian Faith Concerning the Moral Ideal?" and "What Is the Christian Faith about Man's Destiny?" There is also an interesting discussion of the question, "What Is the Christian Faith about Other Religion?"

We *can* keep the Christian faith. We have the right to believe. Christianity when rationally interpreted is consistent with itself and with the established facts of science. "It is one of the eternally possible ways of construing the world" (p. 187). But *shall* we keep the faith? That is a question the answer to which belongs in a realm of speculation. While Professor Pratt disclaims any degree of infallibility in prediction, he permits himself and the reader the pleasure (and pain) of considering the various possibilities in the two concluding chapters of

the book: "Shall We Keep the Faith?", and "But If Not?"

The reading of this book will provide both pleasure and pain to the teacher of religion. The great contribution of the book is its philosophical undergirding of the Christian faith. In some quarters, this emphasis upon Christianity as a *rational* philosophy may be unwelcome. No doubt Professor Pratt will be criticized for his stress upon the rational element in what is after all a *faith*. It is, however, a part of the author's purpose to attack the anti-intellectualism of Barth and his followers in this country. The New Supernaturalism in Pratt's view, is not the way in which we shall be able to keep the faith. The average teacher will be glad to be reinforced in his belief that one may present Christianity to students as a *rational* faith.

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

The Bible

The Origins of the Bible. By THEODORE GERALD SOARES. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941. xi+277 pages. \$2.50.

This is more than a conventional narrative of origins such as the usual introduction furnishes. Intended primarily for laymen, it embodies the fruits of critical scholarship with a minimum of technical terms. It gives ample attention to cultural backgrounds, social processes and the developing religious experiences and needs of which the Bible is the precipitate.

The method of presentation is original and interesting. The gaps in our knowledge of the literary history of the Bible are bridged by the skillful use of a *dramatis personae* of imaginary but naturally-conceived characters who represent the "unknowns" in Old and New Testament literary creation. Occasionally these characters are made to carry on fancied conversa-

tions which explain their problems and purposes. As warrant for his use of these "persons," Dr. Soares declares his belief that "no masterpiece of literature was ever written by a 'school.' . . . However much preparation by many hands, . . . and whatever later editorial amendments, . . . each great literary work was done by a single master hand." Thus the Jahwist is the Interpreter; the Elohist, the Narrator; the JE editor, the Compiler; the writer of Kings, the Theologian; and so on. The Synoptic sources are represented by the Translator, who put Matthew's Aramaic story into Greek (Q); the Third Disciple (after Peter and Matthew), who preserved the parables embodied in the completed Gospel of Matthew; the Fourth Disciple, who remembered the parables used by Luke; the Universalist, who was the Antiochan Christian who compiled the Gospel of Matthew and transformed Jewish particularism into a universal faith. It will be seen that Dr. Soares endeavors to simplify the multiple-source theory, yet he does not wholly avoid the confusion which attends this complex process. Here, indeed, he finds it necessary to insert a brief excursus on the Synoptic Problem to summarize the data previously dramatized.

Treatment of the Fourth Gospel is marked by fine insight and sensitiveness, with special attention given to this evangelist's own dramatic presentation of his theology. Another illuminating chapter is the discussion of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose author is called the Progressive because he set forth the ongoing purpose of God in providing the "better way" in Christianity. To this writer, a disciple of Paul, is given the credit for bringing to complete solution the problem of the Jewish Scriptures in the Christian Church.

Throughout his treatment of the whole range of biblical literature, Dr. Soares' account is fresh and interesting. Footnotes and references have been omitted from the

body of the book, but a helpful index of biblical quotations, arranged by pages, is provided, and an equally good general index. A single slip on the first page puts the Habiru on an "oasis in the great desert west (sic) of the land we now call Palestine."

JOHN W. FLIGHT.

Haverford College

The Search for God. By MARCHETTE CHUTE. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1941. 320 pages. \$2.75.

The "search" here set forth is that progressive quest, recorded in the Bible, for the truth of life and the perfect God. The men of Israel were sure that "somewhere there existed a perfect relationship between God and man, and it was capable of being found."

Disavowing the "way of the theologian" and the "way of the scholar" Miss Chute proposes to "let the Bible illuminate itself," with a resultant treatment which might perhaps be called homiletic. Nevertheless the author makes able use of both the theological and scholarly points of view in the course of her interesting study.

There are four parts: The Right to Search; the Object of the Search; The Search; The Finding. In the first part Job is taken as typical of "Israel, the striver with God" in exercising the right of free inquiry. The second part examines Genesis I-III and here the thesis of the book is found, with an ingenious interpretation given these chapters. The critical position on Gen. I-III is objectionable to the author because it supposes the final editor to be so stupid as to set two contradictory creation stories side by side without explanation and with apparently no other reason than to preserve both. The juxtaposition, says Miss Chute, is rather to be sought in the deliberate purpose of a very skillful editor: to cancel out the second story by the first. The Gen. I story, written by a rigorous monotheist, presents a Creator of an ideal world, not one

like our present world but a perfect one such as the prophets came to believe would be established on the "Day of the Lord"; He is a God of order, of light and life, not of darkness and death. The Lord God of Gen. II-III, on the other hand is a feeble, bungling deity who by his very inefficient, arbitrary character is calculated to explain the agony, disorder and terror of the world of man's actual experience, which ends in death. He is "the obvious God . . . and the men of Israel did not want an obvious God; they wanted the truth. . . . The history of the Bible is the story of the long, slow repudiation of this God." Wherever and whenever the religious leaders were true to the deep, native desire of Israel, they strove to find and make real the experience of the ideal God, confident that with the discovery would come also a perfect life, free from sin and death. The whole of the Old Testament literature is surveyed as the record of the Hebrews' search, merging into the Jewish search as reflected in the later Old Testament books and in the books of Enoch and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The New Testament brings us to the Finding.

Most of the biblical books are set well within the usually-accepted frame of history; only occasional confusions appear, as when Nahum is made a younger contemporary of Micah, or Jonah is treated as though his "parable" belonged to the time of Nahum and Obadiah.

The Fourth Gospel receives almost exclusive attention among the New Testament books, because it is thought to furnish the "only reasonable explanation in existence of why Jesus' doctrine so terrified the Pharisees" and led to His death. The Synoptics (and Paul and Peter as well), with their Jewish Messianic interpretation, were too much committed to the apocalypses of Judaism to understand Jesus as John did; they were closer to the "men of Judah" than to the true succession of the "men of Israel."

John (and it is implied that the Apostle wrote the Fourth Gospel) truly interpreted Jesus as the greatest of Israel's prophets who brought the age-long quest of Israel to its conclusion, fully and finally revealing the perfect God of light and life, with whom to live is to find eternal life now.

The book is well written, the fruit of much careful, discerning thought, and is worthy of thoughtful reading for its honesty and its fine insights.

JOHN W. FLIGHT

Haverford College

The Prophets and their Times. By J. M. POWIS SMITH. Second Edition, revised by WILLIAM A. IRWIN. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941. xvii + 342 pages. \$2.50.

It is a healthy sign of the vitality of Biblical investigation in recent years that after sixteen years J. M. P. Smith's excellent manual on the prophets should require such an extensive revision in order to present the present stage of research. Professor Irwin has accomplished his difficult task with reverence for his former teacher, without sacrificing however sound original scholarship. He has not only brought the bibliography and the notes up to date, but aside from innumerable changes he has felt compelled to rewrite the chapter on Ezekiel *in toto*.

Although recent research has been taken into account, the book has retained its character of a clear, simple, non-technical introduction to the study of the Hebrew prophets from Deborah to Daniel, with particular attention to the political vicissitudes of Israel and the ancient Near East during this period.

In a number of points the conclusions of Dr. Irwin differ from those generally held. For him the prophets were *not* ecstatics. He believes that the Greek word *prophetes* ("one who speaks for, or in behalf of, another") is an accurate translation

of *nabi'*, the Hebrew word for prophet, which he renders "spokesman." And yet he cites side by side two other radically different notions of prophecy. On the one hand he still identifies prophets and "seers" (I Sam. 9:9, a notorious late gloss), on the other he admits that "to prophesy" in ancient Israel could mean "to be insane." The confusion is increased by the fact that Irwin tells us that the title of "seer" was given to Samuel and to Gad (p. 2) without warning the reader that these two men were (according to the Hebrew) entirely different types of seers: Samuel was a clairvoyant and Gad was a prognosticator—and from all appearances neither was a prophet while he was alive. The wild frenzies of the sons of the prophets in the time of Saul and later, the inability of most observers to distinguish between one of these ecstatics and a raving lunatic, as well as the fact that none of them ever uttered a divine oracle, seem to prove that prophecy had originally nothing to do with divination, although by the time of Ahab prophets were consulted by kings. The prophets believed themselves filled, during the moments of trance, with the divine spirit and eventually became the mouthpieces of the deity. Granting however the validity of Irwin's view, according to which prophets were divine spokesmen from the beginning, we fail to understand why he chooses, as the earliest examples of prophets, Deborah, Samuel, Gad, and Nathan and fails to even mention Moses, who was the first and outstanding spokesman of Jehovah.

In regard to Ezekiel, it is unfortunate (as the author himself admits) that he has presented his new solution "of the riddle of the book" too succinctly for clarity. While certain similarities between his theory and those of V. Hertrich (1932) and I. G. Matthews (1939) are obvious, we fail to get a clear conception of the personality of the prophet, of the amount of genuine material in the book, and of its various

redactors, such as "a Babylonian editor," "a gentle and pious Jew of the Greek period or later," of a later commentator "whose mood was stern," and of "numerous men" who contributed their comments. We hope that Dr. Irwin will present his case in a separate monograph, and substantiate his conclusion that "the Book of Ezekiel is not the father, but the child, of Judaism."

A few questionable views on matters of detail may be mentioned. "Hosea contracted . . . a dubious union not once, but twice" (p. 74), first with Gomer, a "wife of a strange god"; then with an adulteress. One of the new elements in the Deuteronomistic legislation was "the sharp differentiation between the clergy and the laity made in the limitation of the priesthood to the Levitical group" (p. 146); but were not the Levites experts in priestly matters even before Saul (cf. Judg. 17-18)? There was no battle at Megiddo when Josiah died (p. 149). "Israel's basic religious thought . . . was faith in the efficacy of the death and resurrection of a god as the means of grace and welfare" (p. 235), and this is the "basic motif" of Is. 53 (p. 237).

Well written and essentially trustworthy, this volume deserves wide circulation.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER

Harvard University

The World-View of Jesus. By ELMER W. K. MOULD. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941. ix + 238 pages. \$2.00.

In *The World-View of Jesus* Dr. Mould, distinguished professor of Biblical History and Literature at Elmira College, presents an amplified form of the 1941 Alumni Lecture at the Yale Divinity School.

Professor Mould has done what would have seemed impossible had he not accomplished it. He has found an approach to Jesus that is both original and fruitful. Jesus has been treated theologically, his-

torically, sociologically, religiously, skeptically. Professor Mould follows none of these methods. He interprets Jesus primarily as a thinker. He does not fall into the trap of calling Jesus a philosopher (despite the statement to that effect on the jacket). Mould distinguishes clearly between the task of the philosopher—which is the intellectual understanding of the universe—and the task of the distinctively religious thinker,— which is concrete and practical. Jesus subordinated philosophical speculation to morality and religion.

Hence Mould, following out a hint of Bultmann, views Jesus as primarily a wisdom teacher, continuing on a higher level the work of Ben Sira. He goes on to develop the "wisdom" of Jesus regarding the Cosmos, man, Providence and purpose, evil, the future, the Kingdom of God, the remnant, and enduring values. These topics are all handled in a fresh and stimulating way. The book closes with a very brief chapter on "Wisdom Incarnate."

There is an ample bibliography, although Professor I. R. Beiler's book on Jesus is omitted. The Notes and References afford orientation for the student who wishes to consult other sources.

The book is to be especially commended for its inclusion of numerous references to Jewish literature, ancient and modern, notably the less accessible apocrypha and pseudepigrapha. On the philosophical side, however, it is weak. The only philosopher to receive more than a casual mention is the learned and excellent D. C. Macintosh. Restriction to a Yale man is perhaps accounted for by the Yalensian provenience of the Alumni lectures; but after all, there is more than one Yale philosopher.

Professor Mould's book is profitable reading for all who are interested in Jesus, whether students or teachers or laymen.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Boston University

Announcing

the publication, after 12 years of continuous effort on the part of a group of leading scholars, including S. H. Hooke, Edwin Smith, I. A. Richards, W. R. Mathews, E. W. Barnes and Martin Linton-Smith, of

THE NEW TESTAMENT *in Basic English*

Basic English is a simplified, clarified form of English, relying on a vocabulary of less than 1,000 words and a few simple rules, with which the sense of anything can be expressed perfectly in English. Passages which have lost much of their power because of the changing meaning of words are revitalized in this New Testament in the simple, straightforward language of today. Many religious teachers who have studied it tell us that THE NEW TESTAMENT IN BASIC ENGLISH offers marked advantages as a classroom text; as a supplementary interpretation to be used with the King James Version. We will gladly send you a copy on approval, together with classroom discount. The Professional Edition is only \$1.50 a copy.

Send Today for Sample Copy on Approval at Professional Discount

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY, 300 Fourth Avenue, New York City

The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus. By GEORGE OGG. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. viii + 339 pages. \$3.50.

This scholarly work, written in a British manner, presents the most thorough, compact, and orderly discussion of the subject which I know in English.

An examination of the evidence of the Gospels and Church Fathers shows that "the Gospels remain our ultimate authorities" (p. 139); even the earliest non-canonical writers had no further information than that which our four Gospels give. Jn. 2:20 fits but does not compel the conclusion that the first Passover of Jesus' ministry was in 30 A. D. Lk. 3:1, 2 is interpreted to mean that Jesus was baptized after the first of Nisan, 28 A. D. In agreement with the Fourth Gospel, the crucifixion is placed on the fourteenth of Nisan, and April 3, 33 A. D. is the date fixed by astronomical calculation.

With these results, Ogg sketches the out-

line of the ministry. The baptism of Jesus probably occurred nearer Nisan, 30 A. D., than Nisan, 28 A. D. The first Passover of the Ministry (Jn. 2:13) was that of 30 A. D. The visits of Jesus to Galilee prior to Jn. 5:1, which refers to Tabernacles, were not for public ministry but for retirement. The Galilean ministry was less than a year in length, falling between Tabernacles, 31 A. D., and Tabernacles, 32 A. D. The crucifixion occurred April 3, 33 A. D.

Valuable as the book is for the serious student of the life of Jesus, four criticisms must be made:

1. The author fails to grapple with the contention of form criticism that there is no reliable chronological outline in the Gospels. He barely touches the subject, and never mentions K. L. Schmidt, Bultmann, or Dibelius.

2. The unqualified acceptance of the chronological framework of the Fourth Gospel as the dominating factor in the final conclusions calls for further argument.

3. It is unsatisfactory to reconcile the Synoptic Gospels with the Fourth Gospel by saying that during the first two years of the ministry, time spent in Galilee was spent in retirement.

4. Ogg plainly states that the Jewish calendar in the first century A. D. was empirically controlled, the month being begun by observation of the new moon and months being intercalated as needed to keep approximately in accord with the solar year and crop seasons. Yet in the end he assumes the infallible accuracy of astronomical calculations, and proceeds to fix the date of the crucifixion as though no element of uncertainty were present.

We need more data than we have in order to solve the problems which this book discusses. Nevertheless, one concludes a study of its pages with respect for the author and with a deepened understanding of the Gospels.

FLOYD V. FILSON

*Presbyterian Theological
Seminary, Chicago*

The New Testament in Basic English. A New Translation. Prepared by S. H. Hooke, Edwin Smith, I. A. Richards, W. R. Matthews, E. W. Barnes, Martin Linton-Smith, and Other Leading Bible Scholars. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1941. 548 Pages. Popular Edition, \$1.50. Regular Edition, \$2.00.

Here is a really new idea in the translation of the Bible. It is a vernacular translation and in this respect like the translations of Moffatt and Goodspeed, to mention only two, but it is also a translation into "basic English." According to the publishers, this is a simplified form of English

worked out by Mr. C. K. Ogden of the Orthological Institute of Cambridge, England. "Basic English is not intended to replace English; but it does provide a quick and easy way of teaching the language to foreigners, to adults of limited education and to children—it is already used for this purpose in four continents—and for English-speaking people it offers a valuable corrective to loose and ambiguous phraseology and a check on the devices of rhetoric that hide the plain sense of what is being said."

While the idea of basic English is novel and arresting, a translation into this medium of communication must be subjected to the same tests which are applied to other translations of the Bible. In an earlier issue of this magazine, the following criteria were suggested:¹ (1) Is the translation based on the original languages? (2) Is the translation based on the best obtainable text? (3) Is it faithful in translation? (4) Is it free from sectarian notes? (5) Does it have proper typographical form? Judged by these standards, *The New Testament in Basic English* merits a high rating.

The only point at which criticism may be anticipated has to do with the third criterion listed above: Is it faithful in translation? The only way to answer this question is to turn to the translation and decide for oneself. The wording of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew, particularly in the last petition, is certain to draw attack: "And let us not be put to the test, but keep us safe from the Evil One." Other passages, however, appear to achieve the accuracy of the leading vernacular translations while preserving much of the dignity and beauty of the King James version. "I am the true vine and my Father is the Gardener. He takes away every branch on me which has no fruit, and every branch which has fruit he makes clean, so that it may have more fruit" (John 15:1). "For as the body is one, and has a number of parts, and all the

¹By Dr. Ismar J. Peritz, *JBR*, Vol. VI (1938), pp. 29-34.

parts make one body, so is Christ" (I Cor. 12:12).

One's first reaction to the idea of a Bible in Basic English is liable to be skeptical. Careful examination of the actual achievement of the scholars engaged upon this work of translation will leave a different impression. In general this translation is faithful to the meaning of the original, while its economy of words makes it well suited for use wherever the chief desideratum is to achieve the highest degree of intelligibility for the widest range of readers.

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions. Edited by H. WHEELER ROBINSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. vii + 337 pages. \$3.75.

Principal Robinson has made several important contributions to Biblical, especially Old Testament, scholarship by books of his own writing and of his editing. The present volume is designed not so much to "bring new knowledge" as to "make old knowledge more accessible," and in this it is very successful. It presents *multum in parvo* and should prove very useful as an introduction to the subject for the general reader and student, and as a compendium of valuable information for the scholar.

The Editor has contributed the first chapter on the Hebrew Bible, in which he discusses the general characteristics of the Hebrew language, surveys the Old Testament literature and canon, and treats the Masoretic text. He makes clear the reason for emendation of this text, but rightly points out that recent scholars are much less given to subjective conjectural emendation than some of their predecessors.

The Greek Bible is treated by W. F. Howard in a very comprehensive manner. As for New Testament textual criticism, he

seems to believe that the best text is represented by the agreements of B (Vaticanus), "the best representative of the Alexandrian family," and k (African Old Latin), "the best of the Western witnesses" (p. 82).

T. H. Robinson discusses the Syriac Bible. This has generally been accorded stepchild treatment by scholars, and therefore is not as well known as it deserves to be. The Old Syriac Gospels in particular are of great value. On p. 91 there should be a reference to C. H. Kraeling, *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatesseron from Dura* (London, 1935). The discovery of this fragment has made it seem probable (but not certain) that the original language of this Harmony was Greek rather than Syriac. The Latin Bible is treated by H. F. D. Sparks. He shows that Jerome's translation, while "immeasurably superior to anything that had gone before" (p. 115), was uneven in quality; also, that it is not yet certain how much of the Vulgate is actually Jerome's work.

More than half of this book is devoted to the various English versions. The early versions through the Wyclifite are treated by Sir William A. Craigie, the sixteenth-century and King James versions by J. Isaacs, and the Revised and later versions by C. J. Cadoux. The Editor has written the last chapter on "The Bible as the Word of God." A useful bibliography and chronological table are appended.

In the early English versions the individual who towers above all the others is William Tindale. Of him Isaacs says: "Tindale's honesty, sincerity, and scrupulous integrity, his simple directness, his magical simplicity of phrase, his modest music, have given an authority to his wording that has imposed itself on all later versions. . . . Nine-tenths of the Authorized New Testament is still Tindale, and the best is still his" (p. 160).

This volume illustrates the fact that the

reasons why the Bible has been so often translated in the past, and doubtless will be often translated in the future, are manifold: increased knowledge of the exact meaning of the original languages, discovery of better manuscripts, the desire to prove or to refute certain doctrines, changes in the language of translation, and so on. Scholars of today are undoubtedly able to make more accurate and objective translations of the Bible than have ever been possible before, even if they cannot match the beautiful rhythm of the King James Version.

The making of new versions has often been a dangerous task, and nearly every new translation has had its opponents. Jerome's enemies complained that his work was "tainted with Judaism" (p. 115). Of the Authorized Version Hugh Broughton is reported to have said, "Tell His Majesty that I had rather be rent in pieces with wild horses, than any such translation by my consent should be urged upon poor churches" (p. 209). We are told that Bishop Coverdale "alone of the early translators died in bed" (p. 182). Modern translators, although they have their enemies, seem to fare better!

Principal Robinson has remarked in the Introduction and first chapter on what he calls "the difficulty and subtlety of the art of faithful translation." Every translation must be, as he says, a compromise. His words on p. 38 are worth quoting: "Perhaps there will always be room for two kinds of translation of sacred Scriptures—the classical version to be used in public worship, even though antiquity has obscured some of its meaning, and the modern vernacular (and more exact) version which can help the private reader to come as near as is possible to the original. But the majesty, dignity, and impressiveness of that original can be felt in their

fullness only by the diligent student of the Hebrew [and Greek!] text."

J. PHILIP HYATT

*Vanderbilt University
School of Religion*

Church History

The Great Century. By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. New York: Harper Brothers, 1941. 516 pages. \$3.50.

This is volume four of "A History of the Expansion of Christianity", previous volumes of which have been reviewed in this journal. It covers the period from 1800 to 1914 and limits itself to the discussion of Christian expansion in Europe and the United States of America.

It will be recalled that this most comprehensive work is to run through seven volumes which will make it quite the most lengthy and detailed study of the expansion of the Christian movement that has yet appeared. Volume I covered the period to about 500 A. D. The second volume carried the story for another 1000 years to 1500 A. D., while the third volume followed the fortunes of the expanding church from 1500 to 1800. Thus three volumes were consumed in recording the history of the first 1800 years. The nineteenth century alone is to require an equal number of volumes. It is indeed "The Great Century". Volume four merely considers Christian expansion in Europe and that part of the Western world which is the United States of America. Two volumes remain in which to tell the story of nineteenth century expansion in the rest of the Western world, in the Pacific Islands, in Australia, New Zealand, and in negro Africa. The whole sixth volume will be given to Christian expansion in Asia in the nineteenth century, and a final volume will record what has happened since the fateful year which saw the beginning of the world war, 1914.

Those who have read the preceding vol-

umes will be familiar already with the author's method. They will be prepared to find the same painstaking, detailed documentation of all the factual material that is presented. They will continue to be amazed at the immense amount of material that must have been covered to bring this study to completion. The literary style is the familiar style of the writer. One wishes sometimes that it were a little less matter of fact, and that some of the exceedingly dramatic episodes were presented in a more colorful fashion. But there is great solidity about it and, as a book of reference, it is invaluable.

This volume after a brief recapitulation of what had gone before turns to an examination first of the movements characteristic of the nineteenth century in the midst of which the expansion of Christianity was accomplished; then of the new movements within Christianity itself which facilitated the expansion; and finally of the process by which Christianity spread. Here one finds a good statement of the respective organizations and methods of Protestantism, Roman Catholicism and Russian Orthodox Catholicism.

One chapter is then dedicated to the spread of Christianity in nineteenth century Europe. The remaining chapters are dedicated to expanding Christianity in America, first among the early American stock, then among the immigrants, then the American Indians, and the negroes. This story has doubtless been told more than once before but no where has it all been brought together so effectively in one volume. It is of great advantage to have such a summary as this so thoroughly well documented throughout.

Chapters are then given on the shifting populations and changing social conditions in America which condition the spread of Christianity; on the effects of Christianity upon its environment; and the effects of the environment upon Christianity. The

discussion of the effects of Christianity upon the environment makes heartening reading for Christian people at a time when it is customary in many quarters to discount so heavily the contribution of religion to our national life. There was need for just such an appraisal. One wishes that this particular chapter could have a much wider circulation than it is likely to get through the sale of so large and relatively expensive a volume. Here perhaps, more than anywhere else, a more dramatic presentation of the material might have been looked for. But there is something decidedly impressive in the methodical and matter-of-fact piling up of the evidence of the profound influence of the Christian faith upon American life.

One of the fine features of this series of volumes is the author's custom of providing summaries at the end of each chapter, where in a few paragraphs he gathers together the main ideas which the chapter has set forth. So also the concluding chapter of the book ties together in succinct fashion the chief facts and principles which the volume as a whole has developed.

Naturally all libraries will expect eventually to have the entire series. So also will many scholars. But fortunately each separate volume can very well be read quite apart from the rest, and some of them will have a much wider circulation than others. Certainly the volumes on "The Great Century" ought to find their way into the libraries of a great host of intelligent laymen as well as ministers of the Christian church.

CHARLES S. BRADEN

Northwestern University

The Kingdom of God and the American Dream. By SHERWOOD EDDY. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941. 319 pages. \$2.90.

The announced purpose of the writer of this study is to trace throughout the history of the American nation the operation of the

religious ideal of the colonial settlers, the secular dream of democracy, and "the negative and sordid element of evil which has worked, consciously or unconsciously, for the perversion or destruction of these high ideals." Disclaiming originality, Mr. Eddy has drawn heavily upon well-known and readily accessible sources to support his thesis that religious idealism had much to do with the shaping of American life from the colonial period to the twentieth century. Such notable examples as the Puritan experiment in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the Quaker settlement in Pennsylvania, the Great Awakening of the eighteenth century, and the rise of various and sundry indigenous denominations and sects with the contributions they have made to the American scene are cited and briefly described.

Sometimes, as Mr. Eddy points out, the effect of religious idealism was narrowing and repressive; at other times it was creative and releasing. It is the author's contention that the ideals of political freedom upon which American constitutional government is based grew out of the principle of religious liberty of the Reformation and out of the experience of the Pilgrims, Puritans, and protesting colonists. He further indicates: "It was in the churches of Boston and Virginia that revolutionary meetings were held. The clergy of the free, dissenting, and popular churches were preaching liberty as a religious principle. The pulpit inspired the Revolution and summoned the faithful to patriotic service and to the realization of the American Dream."

On the other hand, the materialism which developed as the frontier was extended and the natural resources were exploited resulted in a compromise of religious idealism and democratic faith with individual initiative which often was nothing more than unmitigated greed. As a consequence there was born the Tragic Era of the post-Civil War period, with its corruption and

graft, and the Gilded Age of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This latter period, according to the author, is typified in the personalities of Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, and Henry Ford, and its chief characteristics are the extremes of wealth and poverty, luxury and want. But despite the inconsistencies in the picture that is America, it is Mr. Eddy's conviction that the religious ideal of the Kingdom of God and the political dream of liberty and freedom for all have had a notable opportunity for expression in the nation's history.

One has the feeling as he reads this interesting study that some of its chapters are not as closely related to each other as they might have been, and that some of the topics are almost too sketchily treated. But these are minor considerations which do not detract from the value of the study as a whole. The book provides excellent background material for anyone who feels the need of reviewing some of the more important periods in American history. It is realistic without being objectionably "debunking." Moreover, it gives support to the view which is frequently overlooked by secular historians—namely, that religion is not a dead issue in American life and never has been. As Mr. Eddy suggests, religion has made notable contributions to the life of the nation in the past, and is continuing to do so in the present. *The Kingdom of God and the American Dream* should commend itself to a wide reading public.

FRANKLIN I. SHEEDER

Ursinus College

Psychology

Chart for Happiness. By HORNE LL HART.
New York: The Macmillan Company,
1940. 198 pages. \$2.00.

This is a sociologist's contribution to the disciplined study of happiness and its achievement.

Most of us accept without question the statement that happiness is a by-product of life and cannot be attained by seeking it. Most of us also believe that happiness is an elusive somewhat that defies analysis and objective study. Professor Hart not only believes in the possibility of such study, he presents a set of "Euphorimeter" tests designed to measure it. "The present book is based on two propositions: first, that it is possible to measure happiness and unhappiness reliably; and second, that, if we can thus measure, we can then move on toward discovering the causal factors by means of which we can learn with more and more effectiveness to eliminate misery and increase joy scientifically" (p. 16).

The principle of the test is simple. Happiness does not occur in a vacuum. It occurs in human relationships. If we take the various aspects of human relationships and use various equivalents for the words "happy" and "unhappy," a set of questions can be devised which will register how the individual feels in these various relationships. By the use of well-established statistical procedures, the questions can be reduced to the most revealing, and a standardized battery of questions prepared. Various research workers in different centers have obtained comparable results confirming the reliability of the method.

One of the most salutary aspects of the author's exposition is his recognition that he is not measuring something which is innate and inflexible. The very taking of the test is revealing of those areas of experience which need attention and the registering of a judgment in the course of the test paves the way for an improvement of the sense of well-being in that area. In fact, a large part of the book is a study of how a greater degree of well-being can be achieved in such areas as play and work, love and home life, by enhancing physical vitality, by substituting success for failure, by improv-

ing one's social attitudes, by availing oneself of religious resources.

Obviously this is not a scientific instrument in the sense that a microscope or a transit is scientific. The unit of measurement is not a precise unit; and that which is measured is rather elusive. Nevertheless, the Euphorimeter is a significant psychological instrument. The Benet-Simon test of intelligence was a rather crude instrument, and even yet, in its present refinement is far from being an instrument of precision. However, it opened up a whole new field of investigation and has given us a more accurate measurement of native intelligence than we ever had before. If the Euphorimeter is used with the same caution that psychometrists now exercise in interpreting the results of Binet-Simon tests, it may prove to be of comparable value in the emotional field.

J. HOWARD HOWSON

Wellesley College

The Saint

The Passing of the Saint. A Study of a Cultural Type. By JOHN M. MECKLIN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941. 206 pages. \$2.00.

Manifest Victory: A Quest and a Testimony. By J. R. MOSELEY. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941. xv + 238 pages. \$1.50.

The approach of Professor Mecklin to the study of saints and sainthood is that of the sociologist. He is interested in the saint as a social phenomenon. The origin of Christian sainthood was in the dualism of apocalyptic; saints were the privileged persons who lived in two worlds. At first, under the influence of the Hebrew conception of a holy nation, all Christians were called saints. Then the term was more restricted, being applied to those who suffered as witnesses to their faith. Later it was extended to include distinguished con-

fessors and ascetics and conspicuously able servants of the Church. The saint was the man or woman who through visions and miracles entered into the secrets of the heavenly world and became the instrument of divine power. The Church was wise enough to recognize the saint and to use him, and from the seventeenth century she regularized canonization and took into her own hands the authorization of sainthood.

The heart of the book is devoted to a study of three great saints: Augustine, Bernard, and Francis of Assisi. Of Augustine it is pithily said that "he thought like a Platonist, felt like a Christian, and acted like a pragmatist." The whole life of Bernard was a series of paradoxes, in which personal humility was mixed with institutional pride. Honestly desiring the solitude of the cloister, he was forced by the demands of the Church to live an active life. A man of humility and compassion, he was unrelenting in his attacks upon Abelard and Arnold of Brescia in his determination to stamp out heretical teaching. Francis, living by the heart rather than the head, never felt the contradiction between his naive interpretation of the teaching of Jesus and the Church of his day. Where other men of similar temper became sectaries, Francis remained a loyal son of the Church.

The spiritual climate of the modern world does not favor the rise of saints. The present emphasis is upon natural law and the supremacy of reason. The experience of the saint lies in the emotional realm, and his influence is limited to those who themselves are largely swayed by feeling. "A man's ideas," says Professor Mecklin, "cannot possibly rise higher than the ideas derived from his social heritage." Is this true? What is the significance of the spiritual pioneers of the race? Does it not lie in the fact that they are not limited by their social heritage, that they break out new roads of experience in which others follow them?

What other hope is there for spiritual progress? At least, in our definition of our social heritage we must make room for a variety of ideas and trends. A recent writer, himself an agnostic, has said: "In our time, an era of intensification of the pressure of scientific discovery on theological doctrine, there has been an extraordinary mutual approximation between the final beliefs of those who started as devout believers and have moved in liberal directions, and those who—starting as agnostics—end by scratching their heads in perturbed desire for a faith." (Hans Zinsser: *As I Remember Him*, page 59).

The second book named at the head of this review may serve as a supplement to Professor Mecklin's stimulating discussion. It is the religious autobiography of a pecan orchardist, a newspaper writer, who finds the significance of his life in his religious experience. A university trained man, for some time a valued college teacher, he has all the marks of the saint, even to visions, leadings, and miracles of healing. He has been associated with Christian Scientists and with fundamentalist sects, but he seems, again like a saint, to sit loose to ecclesiastical associations. His reading is catholic, ranging from Moody and S. D. Gordon to Whitehead and Schweitzer. Such chapter headings as "Baptism with Ineffable Union," "Perfect Everything," and "The Way of Immediate Guidance" may not attract college Bible teachers, but the reader will have no doubt of the sincerity and humility of the man who tells his story, and whose ecstatic experiences have been harnessed to the most difficult tasks of Christian service.

JOHN PITT DEANE

Beloit College

Miscellaneous

What I Believe. By SHOLEM ASCH. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1941. 201 pages. \$2.00.

Over 100 Adoptions

on

Elmer W. K. Mould's

**ESSENTIALS OF
BIBLE HISTORY**

678 pages

Price \$2.90

"The book's completeness justifies use of the term encyclopaedic. Not only does the author give a thorough and readable account of the history, literature, and religion of the Old and New Testaments, but a great variety of other material. . . . There are introductory chapters dealing with 'The Biblical World,' 'The Peoples of the Bible,' 'Digging in Bible Lands,' and 'The Culture of the Ancient Biblical World.' The last chapter of the book, called 'The Completed Bible,' includes an account though brief of the more important translations. Every book of the Bible and the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha receives separate treatment. . . . A number of valuable teaching aids will be found. . . . There is a list of literary types in the Bible with page references to passages in the book where these are discussed; a glossary of technical terms; a list of useful books called 'The Bookshelf'; a detailed chronological chart; a list of 'Epochs of Biblical History,' or decisive turning-points; and a generous number of maps. We predict that this book will be widely used. So far as we know it is the best book in the field of biblical history."

Carl E. Purinton, Beloit College,
in the "Journal of Bible and
Religion," August 1939.

THOMAS NELSON AND SONS

385 Madison Avenue, New York

No abstract treatise, this new volume by the author of *The Nazarene* is a simple, vivid, beautifully written presentation of the faith, hopes and understandings of a Jew in our contemporary civilization. While not written as philosophy, it does contain in its implications a philosophy of history, a philosophy of religion and an *apologia* for Judaism.

Man is a part of nature and his religions are all derived from it. *Religion* is an act of subordination of man before a particular God. But *faith* takes man beyond nature. It is an "inner belonging, immediate contact with God". It believes in God, not gods. It cannot be apprehended by reason, but is a result of God's grace.

Faith first appeared when God revealed Himself to Abraham. "Until Abraham there was no faith." Faith means belonging to God, and Abraham was a friend, not a slave, of God. Through the patriarchs, God's authority for the first time came to be accepted. At Mt. Sinai God forced the Hebrews under Moses to accept His Law which was intended to govern every detail of life. The prophets expanded the understanding of what the Law truly demands, rejecting sacrifice and emphasizing authority and obedience. Judaism brought three contributions: belief in monotheism, man's part in divinity assured through authority, and the vision of a universal redeemer.

Jesus brought God's authority to the Gentiles. He was unique solely because he interpreted the Law on his own authority. Being unable to give proof of his right to speak in this way, he was rejected by the Jewish authorities. The Gentiles, who had no other authority, were able to accept him. All the values in Christianity are Jewish. Since Jesus did not usher in the Kingdom of God, both Jews and Christians now await the coming of the Messiah.

J. CALVIN KEENE

Colgate University

BOOK NOTICES

South of God. By CEDRIC BELFRAGE. New York: Modern Age, 1941. 346 pages. \$2.50.

This is the biography of Claude Williams, a minister of the Gospel who has chosen to adventure on behalf of righteousness, asking few questions as to what might happen to himself. It is the story of what did happen to him when he dared to make that adventure in the kingdoms of cotton and coal.

He was born the son of a poor cotton farmer, worked his way through college, won an officer's epaulet in the Army, began his ministry as a "Soul Saver," but gradually became convinced that the Kingdom of God meant social justice here and now. He took a church where coal and cotton lived on poverty wages and devoted himself to those who existed upon them. Here his battle with institutionalism in the church and officialdom in the labor unions drove him out of both, but failed to swerve him from his devotion to the cause of "the least of these." He suffered poverty, persecution, went to jail, was beaten by plantation vigilantes, but persisted in helping to organize the cotton tenants and share croppers, never losing his deep conviction that only the teaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God as social justice here and now will bring a good society.

Convinced that in the fundamental social teachings of Christ and the prophets lies the way to securing social justice and that the share croppers' church is the best instrument through which to work, he is now devoting himself to instructing the preachers in them, white and black, in the teachings of the prophets and Jesus.

Belfrage's story of his life and work is as realistic a piece of writing on the Southern scene as anything yet written, but with the background of actual events and the real incidents in the life of one who dares to adventure for righteousness as a minister of the Gospel, it is "truth stranger than fiction." Claude Williams could say of himself as did Isaiah of old:

"I let them lash my back—

I never hid my face for shame or insult."

ALVA W. TAYLOR

Founders of Christian Movements. Vol. III in *Creative Personalities Series.* PHILIP LOTZ, editor. New York: The Association Press 1941. 160 pages. \$1.25.

Religious educators are awakening to the value of biography in teaching Church history or the Christian way of life. This volume is as good as its predecessors in the Series (*Vocations and Professions and Women Leaders*) and is even better if one wants to study not merely high endeavor and true nobility but the distinctive elements of Christianity. Here we have men as contrasted as St. Francis and John Calvin, as Ignatius Loyola and George Fox, as St. Paul and William Channing. Together with other like leaders they help us to understand what qualities have been needed and what efforts have been successful in keeping the Christian movement alive through the ages.

The sketches are necessarily briefer than those in Allen Hunter's *Three Trumpets Sound* or than in Fred Eastman's *Men of Power* Series. They are not arranged chronologically and woven in with a chronicle of events as in H. M. P. Davidson's splendid new book, *Good Christian Men*, but they are vividly written and include much more than the bare facts of the individual's "life and works." Often quotations from his writings or comments of others about him and always a list of references and some carefully chosen questions for discussion are included.

As in the other books he has edited, Mr. Lotz has persuaded men and women to do the writing who are especially well prepared for dealing with the particular person assigned. For instance Georgia Harkness writes on John Calvin, A. J. W. Myers on Robert Raikes and Horace Bushnell, Thomas R. Kelly on George Fox. All in all, an exceedingly useful book for anyone working with young people's groups.

The Bible

Handbook of the Bible. By GERALD E. SEBOYAR. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1940. 247 pages. \$1.25.

The author of this handbook is Professor of General Literature in New York University. From

his wide knowledge of the field of literature he has compiled a list of masterpieces of art which deal with biblical themes. The method of organizing this material has been to list names of persons, places, and books of the Bible, to make a brief explanatory statement after each name, and then, where such materials exist, to list the literary associations or to indicate the influence of biblical themes upon painting and music. Thus under "Genesis," we find listed thirteen works of "literature" inspired by the book, six famous paintings, and four masterpieces of music. It is worth the price of the book to be reminded of the value of J. W. Johnson's *The Creation* in "getting across" the religious feeling of the book of Genesis.

Heroes of the Bible. By OLIVE BEAUPRE MILLER. Chicago. John A. Dickson Publishing Co., 1940. 542 pages. \$3.95.

Another Bible for children of perhaps eight to twelve years centers attention on the heroes, beginning with Abraham and ending with Paul. The book is attractive in print and binding and profusely illustrated by Mariel Wilhoite. In accordance with the conservative point of view, Moses builds an elaborate tabernacle, Joshua reads all the law to the people, David writes the Psalms, and Lazarus really arises from a grave. There is an attempt to help the child relate the Bible to the store of knowledge he may be accumulating in school by a use of historical facts in connection with Sumerians, Egyptians and other peoples but even such a simple re-arrangement of Biblical material as the placing of the Daniel stories in the Maccabean period is not utilized.

The Biblical phraseology is often reproduced though the stories are freely retold. Sometimes the vocabulary of the writer is not such as would seem natural to a child and again one wishes the text had been left to make its own impression rather than to have Jesus' words explained as in the account of the Last Supper; "Jesus commanded his disciples to show by an outward sign that they devoted themselves to eating the truths he had taught them and drinking the cup of his purpose to save the world from its sins."

In general the Old Testament is better handled than the New though occasionally too many facts are crowded into the story. There seems to be a feeling that every minor prophet must be included somewhere.

Every reading of a child's Bible impresses one afresh with the difficulty of making this book written for adults of a bygone age into one that will be of interest and worth to a modern child. This volume is better than many.

And Great Shall Be Your Reward. Yale Studies in Religion: Number 12. By PAUL S. MINEAR. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941. vii + 74 pages. \$1.00.

We hear of "virtue for virtue's sake," but Professor Minear in his study of "The Origins of Christian Views of Salvation" rightly observes that "all religion promises values to adherents," and that "the appeal to reward is present, though often disguised or submerged" (p. vi). He therefore presents a noteworthy study of the values and rewards of religion, although he recognizes that "to separate the end-product of salvation, the reward, from the motive and means of salvation does violence to the truly religious consciousness" (p. vii).

Informative studies of Rewards in Judaism, Salvation in Hellenistic Culture, and Jewish Efforts at Syncretism of these two streams of religious development are particularly valuable because they keep in close touch with the individual and social experience of the ancient period. These discussions prepare for the analysis of the gospel of Jesus, and his eschatologically centered thought of reward. But Paul, Minear holds, effected the one real synthesis between the Jewish and Hellenistic conceptions of salvation.

In the epilogue Minear points out modern equivalents of the Jewish, Hellenistic, and synthesizing views. The entire work is clearly written, well documented, and highly instructive. It shows competent awareness of current study of the meaning of history. My chief question is whether the creative vitality of Jesus receives adequate recognition.

FLOYD V. FILSON

*Presbyterian Theological
Seminary, Chicago*

Homiletics

Preaching From the Bible. ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD. New York and Nashville. The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 1941. 247 pages. \$2.

The minister today is more interested in the Bible than he was several years ago. This book attempts to "show the student how he can preach from the Bible, as well as what he should preach." It aims to be a practical tool. Examples of famous "Bible preachers" are given. The conservative tone of the book is indicated in the choice of Clarence Edward Macartney as the present day model. The possibilities in Biblical preaching are set forth in detailed description of the biographical sermon, the biographical series, the paragraph, the paragraph course, the expository lecture, the chapter

sermon, the book sermon, etc. The reader is made to feel the wealth of Biblical resources, but the whole business of preaching seems too simple. One feels little of the terrific clash of ideas, of the rough and tumble of intellectual and spiritual conceptions of the present times. Furthermore, the social gospel, as such, is practically ignored.

How to Find Health Through Prayer. GLENN CLARK. New York: Harper & Bro., 1940. 154 pages. \$1.50.

This is a curious book. It is a combination of Biblical interpretation, Christian Science, mental hygiene, oriental mysticism, and high-pressure American salesmanship. Its thesis is that physical illness is the result of the concomitant of mental and spiritual disorder. Clear up the mind, cleanse the spirit, and disease will take its flight. Sickness is fundamentally unreal. Health comes by putting oneself in tune with God, with whom it is possible to "deny the existence in Heaven of the wrong thing thought or felt" (p. 101). There are flashes of insight, but the great weakness of the book is the extravagance of its claims. Particular diseases are attributed to specific mental twists, e.g. "cancer victims are nearly always . . . the kind who are too 'ladylike' or 'gentlemanly' to give expression to" a grudge (p. 41). "When young people suffer from anemia it is because they are not having enough fun in life" (p. 45). The basic assumption is that wrong thinking "may be the cause of each particular illness" (p. 38). It is difficult for this reviewer to be patient with this work. He recently conducted a funeral service for a young married woman, whose death resulted from the unwillingness of her husband for religious reasons to call a doctor when she went into a state of coma. Religion can be a dangerous thing, if too much is claimed for it.

ELMER E. VOELKEL

*First Congregational Church,
Beloit, Wisconsin*

The Strong Name. By JAMES S. STEWART. New York: Scribner's, 1941. 260 pages. \$2.00.

Scotland is a stronghold of Protestant Christianity. For four hundred years its people have gone to church, carrying their Bibles with them. Night by night in hundreds of homes, old and young have gathered round "the Book" and knelt in family prayer. Hence the ministers of religion have been challenged to diligent study and to earnest and reasonable exposition of the great doctrines of the church. The result has been the production of great preachers. Among living preachers in Scotland one of the most out-standing is James

S. Stewart of the North Morningside Church, Edinburgh.

The sermons or studies, for they are both, contained in this volume, are divided into three groups, based on the Benediction: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ; the Love of God; the Communion of the Holy Ghost." A glance at the contents of the first group brings the first surprise. Here are the titles: *Sursum Corda!* The Miracle of Reconciliation; *Spirits in Prison*; The Transformation of Tragedy; The Gospel of the Ascension; The Voice that Wakes the Dead; Who is this Jesus? (1) Behold the Man; (2) Behold your God; The Triumphant Adequacy of Christ. A church-going man would be interested in such themes, so stated.

Whether you are likely to want to sit through a sermon depends on the opening sentences. Here are some of Mr. Stewart's: "When Jesus spoke these words, He turned history upside down." "It is at once the glory and the doom of man to have been made for fellowship with God." "There was one strange question which haunted the imagination of the early Church: Where was Jesus between the crucifixion and the resurrection?" This element of interest runs through each sermon. The illustrations are invariably good. The scholarship is sound. We can imagine that the worshippers in Edinburgh are regular attendants at church. It would not be surprising to find that a preacher of this type could be sought after in an American city.

JOHN GARDNER

*The Community Church,
Garden City, N. Y.*

Candles in the Wind. By ALLAN KNIGHT CHALMERS. New York: Scribner's, 1941. 224 pages. \$2.00.

The Author is one of the out-standing ministers of New York. He says that these chapters are not sermons. They have qualities which would make them sermons of unusual interest, for they reveal a man whose soul is aflame. Dr. Chalmers feels deeply and acts heroically. He says "Life is not right—it does not feel right; you cannot trust it—unless, against the jungle law, you set the faith that this is my Father's world." Having that faith he takes the train south to help the unfortunate negro boys involved in the terrible Scotsboro trial. He says again, "It is fun to play with religion. . . But seeing what it can do to a man if religion becomes a serious business you had better be warned: do not let it get you. You can escape, on the one hand, by criticizing it, which releases you from a feeling of obligation, or better than that, you can erect the convenient barriers of plausible limita-

tions against the obvious responsibilities which come from the Christian revelation of God." A man who thinks and speaks like that will make long journeys to help share croppers, or arrange a communion service for conscientious objectors who are being sent to jail. Dr. Chalmers reads widely both in poetry and fiction, as well as theology and social ethics; hence his chapters glow with fine quotations. *Candles in the Wind* is a challenging book and will be read through by any one who takes it up. Readers will frequently dissent from the author. Yet they will find themselves different after the author is through with them.

JOHN GARDNER

The Book of English Collects. By JOHN WALLACE SUTER. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941. 432 pages. \$2.90.

The title quite accurately describes the contents of the book. It is a valuable addition to the numerous recent volumes on worship. It is a rich source of collects or prayers for corporate or private worship. Dr. Suter has brought together in this attractively printed book, 579 collects from the Prayer Books of the various branches of the Anglican Church throughout the world—England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada, South Africa and the United States. The first section contains the Collects of the Church Year; the remainder of the book consists of prayers for various occasions and purposes, as the ministry, sickness, baptism, marriages, confirmation, family prayers, etc. The introductory chapter is an excellent critical discussion of the nature of the Collect form. It is the sort of book every one interested in worship would do well to read.

W. O. JOHNSON

St. Paul's Episcopal Church,
Beloit, Wisconsin

Archaeology

How Firm a Foundation. By JAMES C. MUIR. Philadelphia: National Publishing Company, 1941. 292 pages.

According to the sub-title, this book is "a survey of the New Testament and the birth and establishment of Christianity in the light of archaeology and secular history." That the author attempts to set before us a living past is good, but the results are greatly limited by his lack of critical analysis of the sources. In treating problems in the study of the life of Jesus and of early Christianity, there is extended utilization of pious speculation which gives a homiletical tone to the book. References

a dependence upon the creditability of certain passages in such a writer as Josephus is shown.

The major part of the book is concerned with the life of Jesus. The rejection of historical criticism is seen by the fact that all four gospels are used as equally valuable sources. Whatever accommodations are possible to escape the differences between the Synoptics and John are made. Thus it is said the gospel of John "stresses the Judaean side of the life of Jesus" (p. 90). The judgments of tradition as to the authorship of the gospels are accepted: the author of Matthew is one of the twelve, etc. Hence the gospels were written by contemporaries of Jesus. The gospel picture of the Pharisees is accepted and they are designated as "representing the height of hypocrisy" (p. 114).

An idea underlying the book is the modernity of the gospels. This is a thesis in which we cannot help but be interested. It would gain much were it accompanied and supported by more adequate critical research.

ROBERT M. MONTGOMERY

Wellesley College

Diggers for Facts: The Bible in the Light of Archaeology. By J. O. KINNAMAN. Haverhill, Mass.: Destiny Publishers, 1940. 239 pages. \$2.50.

This is a popular book on archaeology and the Bible of the type which sets up a false antithesis between archaeology and higher criticism. While it contains some interesting facts, these are so mixed with misleading information and illogical conclusions that the book cannot be honestly recommended to the serious student.

J. P. H.

Miscellaneous

Current Religious Thought: A Digest. By CHARLES S. MACFARLAND. New York: Revell, 1941. 185 pages. \$1.50.

The character and contents of this book may be inferred from the title: it is a brief summary of over forty significant books of the year, with abundant quotation in the original words. To read it through at one sitting would be like making a meal on a handful of malted milk tablets. Dr. Macfarland's main purpose is that of exposition. Where the exposition seems to lack clearness, one suspects a similar lack in the book under review, or at most attributes it to lack of space. The reader is impressed both by the fairness of the author and by his ability to state in brief form the main ideas of one book after another. Although the role of critic is kept subordinate,

short paragraphs at the end of the several sections and thought-provoking parentheses inserted here and there reveal the alert reviewer with a point of view of his own. The final chapter is a succinct analysis of present-day trends in religious thinking. The volume should be of real service to the minister or teacher who is asking what book or what books to read next.

JOHN PITT DEANE

Beloit College

A Testament of Devotion. By THOMAS R. KELLY. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941. 124 pages. \$1.00.

There are comparatively few really great devotional books. Of this work Rufus Jones says, "Here is a book I can recommend along with the best of the ancient ones." The author was professor in the department of philosophy at Haverford College at the time of his sudden and untimely death in 1941. Of him, in a biographical memoir, Douglas V. Steere says that "in the late autumn of 1937 a new life direction took place in Thomas Kelly. No one knows exactly what happened, but a strained period in his life was over. He moved toward adequacy" (p. 18). The essays in this book reflect the religious achievement of this last period in the life of Thomas Kelly. Most of them were printed in *The Friend*, a Quaker literary and religious journal. Titles of the essays are "The Light Within," "Holy Obedience," "The Blessed Community," "The Eternal Now and Social Concern," and "The Simplification of Life." The central concern of the writer is to show how one may lead a religious life in the world, not by turning one's back upon it. "What is here urged are ways of conducting our inward life so that we are perpetually bowed in worship, while we are also very busy in the world of daily affairs" (pp. 31-32). Thomas Kelly speaks frequently of the two levels on which we may live, the secular and the religious. Between these two levels there may be a fruitful interplay: "For the religious man is forever bringing all affairs of the first level down into the Light, holding them there in the Presence, reseeing them and the whole of the world of men and things in a new and overturning way and responding to them in spontaneous, incisive and simple ways of love and faith" (p. 36). This inner reference transforms all outward experiences, such as social relationships. It places friendships in a new perspective and provides the basis for religious fellowship, the creation of "The Blessed Community." It enables one to find "Simplification of Life," not by flight from the complexities of

civilization to some South Sea paradise, but by a re-orientation of our inward lives. This little book contains many valuable suggestions for all those who desire to deepen their own personal and social living.

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

Honest Answers to Honest Questions. By S. RALPH HARLOW. New York. Nashville: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1940. 105 pages. \$1.00.

These questions range from such straightforward ethical problems as cheating and lying to political queries about internationalism and to intellectual problems concerning the relation of science and religion. The answers are brief and one feels that with the personality of the author behind them they would be effective in groups of high school students. They are hardly meaty enough for the college age. It is difficult to imagine a seventeen-year-old reading the book, with its rather fine print, but leaders who wish to make similar addresses would find suggestions here.

MURIEL S. CURTIS

Wellesley College

The Kosher Code. By EDWARD A. BOYDEN and S. I. LEVIN. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1940. 234 pages. \$4.50.

The cooperative learning of Professor Edward A. Boyden, professor of Anatomy in the University of Minnesota and of Rabbi S. I. Levin of Minneapolis, scholar in rabbinic lore, has produced a work of uniform excellence. Heretofore such technical subjects as Talmudic medicine or the laws of Jewish ritual slaughtering of animals have as a rule been treated either by scientists who were deficient in Hebrew learning, or by Hebraists who were amateur scientists. The combination of a fine expertness in both aspects of the rules governing Jewish ritual slaughtering and the detailed examination of the carcass to authorize its fitness for food, gives in this volume a truly valuable contribution to the history of veterinary knowledge and of public health. The authors are to be congratulated on the authoritative and admirable result of their cooperative scholarship.

D. DE SOLA POOL

*Spanish and Portuguese
Synagogue New York City*

THE ASSOCIATION

NAMES NOT ON MEMBERSHIP LIST PUBLISHED IN FEBRUARY 1941

Rev. John L. Cheek, Ph. D., 6945 S. Carpenter St., Chicago, Ill.
 Prof. Russell J. Compton, Ph. D., Wesley College, Grand Forks, N. D.
 Rev. Ruth S. Conant, D. B., 106 Niles St., Hartford, Conn.
 Rev. Harry W. Foot, First Congregational Church, Dalton, Mass.
 Mrs. Winona M. Gay (Mrs. Leon F.), 13 Sterling Road, Waltham, Mass.
 Prof. Randall B. Hamrick, D. B., West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, W. Va.
 Prof. D. Johnson Hansford, D. D., Mercer University, Macon, Ga.
 Prof. Clarence Horace Hewitt, A. M., Aurora College, Aurora, Ill.
 Pres. T. Ross Hicks, Th. M., D. D., (Wesley College), 3024 University Ave., University Sta., Grand Forks, N. D.
 Miss M. Elisabeth Hudson, M. R. E., (Mississippi State College for Women), Box 1084, College Sta., Columbus, Miss.
 Rev. Norman Huffman, Ph. D., Box 6, Waxhaw, N. C.
 Prof. Obed S. Johnson, Ph. D., (Wabash College), 105 Vernon Court, Crawfordsville, Ind.
 Prof. Balmer H. Kelly, King College, Bristol, Tenn.
 Prof. Chas. D. Kepner, Jr., Ph. D., (Schauffler College), 5059 Broadway Ave., Cleveland, O.
 Prof. C. M. Laymon, S. T. B., (Union College), 325 College St., Barbourville, Ky.
 Prof. Addison H. Leitch, (Grove City College), 601 Spring St., Grove City, Pa.
 Miss Rachel Marks, A. M., Ward-Belmont School, Belmont Heights, Nashville, Tenn.
 Mrs. Mary McCoy, Alabama College, Montevallo, Ala.
 Rev. John W. McKelvey, D. B., 2506 Brown St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Prof. Milton D. McLean, A. M., Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.
 Prof. Clyde W. Meredith, D. B., Marion College, Marion, Ind.
 Dr. Joseph L. Mihelic, Ph. D., 817 East 58th St., Chicago, Ill.
 Prof. John D. Mills, A. M., (Friends University), 1415 University Ave., Wichita, Kans.

Miss Lucetta Mowry, 233 Edwards St., New Haven, Conn.
 Dean Wm. H. Powers, A. B., D. D., Hendricks Chapel, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Miss Ann Putcamp, A. M., International House, Chicago, Ill.
 Rev. Delton L. Scudder, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
 Rev. Wm. R. Seaman, S. T. D., St. Peter's Church (Lutheran), Stowe, Pa.
 Prof. Esther Stranahan, A. M., William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa.
 Miss Henrietta Thomson, Chatham Hall, Chatham, Va.
 Mr. LeRoy E. Train, D. B., (North Park College), 5519 North St. Louis Ave., Chicago, Ill.

PERSONNEL

S—3—Man; A. B. (Classics), Muhlenberg; M. A. (Bible), U. of Penna.; B. D. (Bible) & S. T. M. (O. T.), Mt. Airy Sem.; S. T. M. Chicago Sem.; S. T. D. Temple U. Now minister in Penna. Desired subjects English bible and ethics.

(Continued from Page 158)

also late, since the only "psalms" in which it is found are Ex. 15 and Gen. 49, but this is explained by the fact that the formula was already archaic at the time of the Hebrew monarchy, when it was no longer in popular usage.

¹⁰See also Gen. 28:13; 31:42; and 32:10 discussed below. Cf. Gen. 48:15. The expression in any case was particularly popular in the post-biblical period. See, for instance, the excellent study by Martin Rist, "The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: A Liturgical and Magical Formula," *JBL*, LVII (1938), pp. 289ff.

¹¹Ex. 3:13; 1 Chr. 5:25; 12:17; 2 Chr. 20:33; 33:12; 34:32. It is naturally missing in Dan. 11:37, where there is no reference to the Hebrew deity.

¹²1 Chr. 5:25; 29:20; 2 Chr. 7:22; 11:16; 13:18; 14:3; 15:12; 19:4; 20:33; 21:10; 24:18, 24; 28:6, 25; 30:7, 19, 22; 33:12; 34:32, 33; 36:15.

¹³2 Chr. 13:12; 28:9; 29:5; Ezra 8:28; 10:11.

¹⁴1 Chr. 12:17; 2 Chr. 20:6; Ezra 7:27.

¹⁵2 Chr. 21:10; 28:25; 30:19; 33:12.

¹⁶Deut. 26:7.

¹⁷Deut. 1:21; 6:3; 12:1; 27:3.

¹⁸Ex. 3:13, 15, 16; Deut. 1:11; 4:1; Josh. 18:3.

¹⁹Ex. 4:5; Deut. 29:24; Judg. 2:12; 2 Ki. 21:22.

²⁰See 2 Chr. 7:22; Neh. 9:9, or compare the allusions to the Hebrew kings sleeping with their "fathers," 2 Ki. 14:29, etc. It is possible that the

Deuteronomic allusion to Amon forsaking Yahweh, the God of his fathers in 2 Ki. 21:22 may have allusion to the Hebrew kings who preceded Amon, particularly in the light of the analogy of Dan. 11:13, and cf. "Yahweh, the God of David thy father," 2 Chr. 21:12, etc.

²¹Gen. 31:5, 29, 42, 53; 32:10 (twice); 43:23; 46:1, 3; 49:25; 50:17. There are two variants in Gen. 26:24 ("I am the God of Abraham, thy father") and Gen. 28:13 ("I am Yahweh, the God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac"). The first of these may have read originally "I am the God of thy Father Abraham," with which we may compare the formula in Gen. 32:10 and 46:1, where the name of the father is last. We shall have occasion to discuss Gen. 28:13 later, but we have obviously a conflate text, awkward in its setting when we realize that it was spoken to Jacob, whose father was Isaac. The prefixed "Yahweh" is reminiscent of the later formulae. Furthermore, the interposition of the name of the patriarch between the two parts of "God of Thy Father," etc., is reminiscent of the later formula "Yahweh, the God of David, thy father," found in Is. 38:5; 2 Ki. 20:5; 2 Chr. 21:12, or of "Yahweh, the God of Israel, our father" in 1 Chr. 29:10. Cf. "Yahweh, the God of my lord, Abraham" in Gen. 24:12, 27, 42, 48.

In any case, judging from the number of occurrences, the expression "God of My (Thy, etc.) Father" was more normative for the early period than "the God of Abraham," etc. The evidence for the early appearance of the latter formula is so tenuous that Alt's attempt to posit a cult of "the God of Abraham," etc., rests on a very flimsy basis.

²²Ex. 3:6; 15:2; 18:4.

²³I.e., 1 Chr. 28:9 ("Know the God of thy father and serve him") and 2 Chr. 17:4 ("For the God of his father he sought"). Both of these passages allude to David as the father of the Judean kings, and they parallel the above-mentioned idiom ("Yahweh, the God of David, thy father") in Is. 38:5; 2 Ki. 20:5; 2 Chr. 21:12, 34:3,—all late-exilic and post-exilic in date. In 1 Chr. 28:9 Solomon is addressed, but the passage obviously has the same significance as 2 Chr. 17:4, where, in the preceding verse, the "father" of Jehoshaphat is identified with David. Cf. 2 Ki. 16:2; 18:3; 22:2, etc., where David is the "father" of Hebrew Kings. See also 2 Chr. 17:3; 28:1; 29:2; 34:2, etc. It may have been in this same late period that in Gen. 28:13 and 32:10 Abraham was, by a similar idiom, designated as the "father" of Jacob, for we have seen reason to suspect that the present form of our formula in these verses is late. In these instances the formula is not thought of with reference to one's immediate parent, in contrast with the earlier usage.

²⁴We have here a conflate text, for we have noted above that the allusion to Abraham as the father of Jacob may be an addition in the light of the later idiom.

²⁵One would expect "the God of Thy Father, Isaac." As in Gen. 32:10 there may be an attempt to interpret the text in the light of later ideologies. Compare also Gen. 26:24; 43:23; 46:1, etc., where Yahweh is significantly omitted in the J source in this formula.

We should note Ex. 3:6, where the first person pronoun precedes the formula, as the Elohist causes

Yahweh to identify himself with the deity of the patriarchs, and Gen. 46:3, where we get "I am the God (ha-el), the God of Thy Father," where ha-el is perhaps used in its generic sense, and the passage is to be interpreted "I am the God (who is) 'the God of Thy Father.'" In any case, in these two instances, the actual name of the deity is not prefixed.

²⁶Compare also the cuneiform *la libbi ilimma assiti metat*, "contrary to the will of god, my wife has died." Lewy, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

²⁷Contrast Lewy, *op. cit.*, p. 55. See the discussion of El Shaddai in JBL (1941) by the present writer.

²⁸Gen. 26:24; 28:13 (see v. 15); 31:5, 42; 46:3 (see v. 4).

²⁹Gen. 26:24; 43:23; 46:3. Cf. also 50:17 (see v. 20); 32:10 (see v. 11); 31:29 (see v. 31).

³⁰Judg. 2:12; 2 Ki. 21:22; 2 Chr. 7:22; 19:4; 20:33; 21:10; 24:18, 24; 28:6; 33:12, etc.

³¹Deut. 1:11, 21; 4:1; 6:3; 12:1; 26:7, etc.

³²1 Chr. 29:20; 2 Chr. 11:16; 13:18; 30:22; Ezra 7:27, etc.

³³Gen. 31:5, 42; 32:10 (twice); Ex. 15:2; 18:4.

³⁴Gen. 46:3; 49:25; 50:17; Ex. 3:6. Six times if Gen. 26:24; 28:13 are included.

³⁵Gen. 31:29; 43:23.

³⁶Gen. 46:1; 31:53.

³⁷We have already suggested an original "God of My Father, Isaac," in Gen. 28:13, as it appears in Gen. 46:1, and have noted that Gen. 32:10 may have alluded to Isaac alone as the "father" of Jacob. In Gen. 31:42 it may be that the parenthetical "God of Abraham and Awe of Isaac" is an interpretative gloss by one who had in mind the later formula, possibly by the same hand that appears in Gen. 28:13 and 32:10, to identify our deity with the God of Abraham. The text may have originally read "the God of My Father, Isaac," as we actually get it in Gen. 46:1 (cf. Gen. 31:5, 53), or "the God of My Father, the Awe of Isaac." We may note that *pahad* ("Awe") is characteristically late, and is found otherwise in the Pentateuch only in Gen. 31:53, where we have "Pahad of my father, Isaac." Gen. 31:53 does not present a clear text. Laban is here made to swear by the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor, which an obvious interpretative gloss identifies with the God of their father (i.e., the father of Jacob and Laban), when "fathers" would be more apt. The LXX and two MSS omit the gloss. Jacob swears by the God of His Father, Isaac, here called the Awe of His Father. In any case, it is significant that Jacob swears not by the God of Abraham, but by the deity of his immediate parent.

³⁸See J. Lewy, *op. cit.*, pp. 50ff.

³⁹As in *Assur u Ilabrat il abini*, or *Assur u Ilabrat il abia*. See Lewy, *op. cit.*, pp. 51ff. Compare the interpretation by Albright, "The Names Shaddai and Abram," JBL, LIV, (1935), p. 190. Cf. H. G. May, *loc. cit.*

⁴⁰Is. 49:26; 60:16; Ps. 132:2, 5. Cf. Is. 1:24, where in a late eschatological passage we have the Abir of Israel.

⁴¹This study should be read in connection with the present writer's more comprehensive analysis of the patriarchal conception of deity in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LX (1941), pp. 113ff.